



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2003

No. 25

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

AUTHORIZE STAMP IN MEMORY OF BRAVE PEACEKEEPERS IN BEIRUT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1983, the war on terrorism began when a truck filled with explosives detonated outside of the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, killing 241 of our servicemen. Between 1982 and 1984, 270 soldiers, sailors, and Marines from 36 States lost their lives while serving as peacekeepers in Beirut.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H. Res. 45 that would express the

sense of the House that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in remembrance of the victims of the Beirut peacekeeping mission. I am certainly not the first to pursue this effort to have the Postal Service authorize a stamp in memory of our brave peacekeepers. For 19 long years, friends, families and comrades of the Beirut victims have lobbied tirelessly to see this dream become a reality. To date, however, these efforts have been unsuccessful.

Mr. Speaker, some of the astonishing reasons that have been given for not issuing the stamp include: We try to honor positive things. People want noncontroversial, pretty stamps; Beirut lacks significance in American history, and not enough people were killed.

Mr. Speaker, I share those comments because this is what I have been told has been said to those many people who for 19 years have been asking that this stamp be created. These explanations are scant justification for failing to recognize those who have given so much to our country. I can assure Members that they amount to little more than a slap in the face to our servicemen and their families.

I am not here today to begrudge stamp selections of the past, but fair is fair. If kittens, red squirrels, Daffy Duck, Chinese dragons, circus wagons, and communist artists are worthy of commemoration by the Postal Service, then so are our fallen heroes from Beirut.

October 3 of this year will mark the 20th anniversary of the Marine Corps barracks bombing in Beirut. The friends, family, and comrades left behind by the Beirut peacekeepers will gather once again to pay their respects. This would be the appropriate time for the Federal Government to show its appreciation. Honoring these servicemen with a stamp is one way for us to finally say thank you for sacri-

ficing their lives so the rest of us can live in freedom.

A stamp in honor of the Beirut peacekeepers would not just serve to further mourn their loss, but to celebrate the peace and the American spirit that was embodied in the mission of these fallen heroes.

Mr. Speaker, in these uncertain times we call upon the brave men and women of the military to defend the ideals that this great Nation was founded upon. One of my constituents, Charles Hall of Jacksonville, North Carolina, was called upon 19½ years ago; and he served our country honorably in Beirut. He will be the first to tell Members that the war on terrorism began well before September 11.

Mr. Speaker, in April the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee will convene in Washington to consider stamp proposals and make recommendations to the Postmaster General. On behalf of military families across the United States, I urge the committee to do what is right for those who made the ultimate sacrifice. I urge them to reconsider that a commemorative stamp be issued in remembrance of the Beirut peacekeepers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close in a certain way. I first ask God to please bless the men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of the men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we might do what is right for the future of this Nation. And I ask God to please bless the President of the United States that he will lead this Nation and this world to a better and peaceful world.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking three times, God please, God please, God please, continue to bless America.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H329

FIGHTING DISEASES AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 1,100 people in India died from tuberculosis. Last month in sub-Saharan Africa, 225,000 people died from AIDS. Last year, more than 1 million people died from malaria around the world.

The White House understands that AIDS, in tandem with tuberculosis, is literally the most devastating epidemic the world has seen since the bubonic plague of the 14th century. These diseases have killed millions. They have their sights set on millions more.

The President laid out the problem well: nearly 30 million people have the AIDS virus in Africa; yet only 50,000 of them are receiving the medicine they need. The great Black Plague of Europe killed 25 million people in the mid-1300s. Last year, there were an estimated 42 million people living with HIV-AIDS around the world. There is little question that HIV, unless we take unprecedented, dramatic action to both prevent further spread and treat all those who require treatment with antiretrovirals and other medicines, will take a much greater social, political and economic toll than even the black plague.

For the first time, the United States is devoting the necessary funding and joining the global fight against these three killers. The President has committed the funding, \$10 billion in new money, to stem the growing tide of this epidemic; but we are not quite there.

The limited number of targeted countries under the President's initiative and the small contribution to the global fund to fight AIDS, TB and malaria, \$1 billion of the \$10 billion, has stifled the applause that followed the President's announcement about how this administration would fight AIDS.

The President is aiming at only 14 countries, 12 in sub-Saharan Africa where the devastation is greatest, and two in our hemisphere, Haiti and Guyana. The White House plan excludes Mexico, Bangladesh, Pakistan, China, India, Russia and Brazil where half the world's people live. It excludes 15 of the 22 high-burden TB countries which account for 80 percent of the world's TB population. If the administration is committed to addressing AIDS, it must also be committed to TB, the biggest killer of people with AIDS. We cannot fight one without fighting the other.

Dr. Richard Feachem, executive director of the Global Fund, told me last week that a go-it-alone bilateral plan simply will not work. While economist and AIDS expert Jeffrey Sachs acknowledges the significance of the President's plan, he questioned the decision to limit support for the Global Fund. "What has not worked is each individual donor planting a separate

flag," and trying to solve the problem alone, he said.

The Global Fund is a public-private partnership begun last year by U.N. General Secretary Kofi Annan, which draws contributions from governments, private corporations, faith-based organizations and foundations. The Global Fund already shows signs that it works. Government entities, in coordination with nongovernment organizations, submit 5-year plans. Each plan is unique to each country, not a one-size-fits-all design which traditional foreign aid programs have too often been.

The Global Fund recognizes cultural differences. What works in Christian Uruguay might not work in Moslem Bangladesh. No overriding, international political agenda is attached to the Global Fund's assistance. No litmus tests, only a judgment by the fund in collaboration with local citizens and health workers of what works best in each country.

The Global Fund demands quantifiable results. The money supports activities, including access to health care services and purchase of drugs. If a country or an NGO fails to show results within 2 years, the money is cut off. Although 60 percent of the Global Fund's money goes to HIV-AIDS, 20 percent goes to TB and another 20 percent roughly to fight malaria. Fighting these diseases together is a cost-effective approach. For example, the infrastructure created in the treatment of TB has been proven to help in the treatment of AIDS, malaria and other diseases. To cure TB, a patient takes medication every day for about 6 months given to him by a health care worker at a clinic or by a health care worker who has traveled to his home. Unlike a smallpox vaccine, regular interaction between health care workers and patients is necessary to cure TB.

If we fully commit to the Global Fund, that means a minimum of \$500 million per year, 2 million patients will be treated for TB over the next 5 years, most of them for less than \$100. Our investment in the Global Fund, rather than a unilateral U.S.-waged effort, will help leverage support from other countries.

Funneling U.S. dollars through U.S. programs alone will not do much to promote a united global front against this global killer. In a very short time, the Global Fund has shown it is capable of tremendous progress. In the first two rounds of grants, the fund has approved 160 proposals in 85 low-income countries.

With significant U.S. funding, the fund will continue to support countries committed to addressing the epidemics killing their people. Without U.S. leadership, it will be a fund in name only and AIDS, TB, and malaria will remain a virtual death sentence in the developing world.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to congratulate the University of Florida on its 150th year in operation and of course to wish them continued success. It is a great privilege to represent such a fine university. I am proud to say that the University of Florida ranks fourth in the Nation among public universities and 10th among all universities in the number of freshman National Merit Scholars in attendance.

Not only do I have the privilege of representing the university, but also the city in which the university was formed, which also happens to be very close to my hometown. In 1853, the University of Florida began as East Florida Seminary in Ocala, Florida. It was created in response to a State decision which allowed public funds to be used to support higher education. It later combined with Florida Agriculture College, St. Petersburg Normal and Industrial School, and South Florida Military College to become the University of the State of Florida, one of four State universities.

Having been formed before the Civil War, the University of Florida has been a profound player in both Florida and American history. In fact, in World War I, the university served as a base for 400 soldiers. These student soldiers were displaced to local boarding houses as sentries to guard the gates and dormitories on campus.

In the mid-1920s, the State of Florida and the university suffered financial difficulties, along with the rest of the country. The Mediterranean fruit fly crippled the State's citrus production, and the deadliest hurricane to ever hit Florida destroyed what was left of the State's economy. Then a year later, the Great Depression began for the collapse of the stock market. State funds for expansion were virtually nonexistent for nearly 20 years thereafter.

In the Second World War, more than 10,000 UF alumni served this country. William Corry and Hubert Schuch, former student body presidents, were among those killed.

□ 1245

The University of Florida has a rich State and national history and it thrives today as one of the premier State universities in the United States. University of Florida students are among the most active in this Nation. With a 46,500-plus student enrollment and 2,000-acre campus, the campus is a lively and stimulating environment for all of its students.

Students at the university lead a rich social and academic life, which is evidenced by the fact that in a single year there are more than 600 student organizations operating on campus and more

than 2,000 campus concerts, art exhibits, theatrical productions, guest lectures, sports concerts and other events in a year.

With an athletics program rivaled by few Division I-A schools, the University of Florida fields some of the most competitive teams in the country. UF scholar-athletes have dominated in every sporting arena, and it is evident from their dozens of national titles. I am proud of the University of Florida's athletic program and foresee continued success.

I also want to congratulate the University of Florida football team for an admirable season. Gator fans across the country should be excited for this program and their new coach, Ron Zook. Coach Zook has put together an outstanding staff, and I look forward to seeing them back on top of the SEC.

Academic institutions shoulder a great responsibility in the health and progress of local communities. They not only teach young people skills in order to succeed, but also intangible advantages like broad-mindedness and a sense of the world around them. Education is our best defense against hatred and poverty, which is why we must invest in institutions that have a proven record of success.

As any Member of this body would be, I am proud to represent one such institution. I congratulate the University of Florida and President Charles Young and wish the university long-lasting success. God bless.

CONGRATULATING MILWAUKIE, OREGON, ON ITS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the international drama and trauma, it is sometimes easy to forget that the primary goal of government is to provide a partnership where our communities can be livable and where our families are safe, healthy and economically secure. My hometown of Portland, Oregon, has received international acclaim as one of America's most livable cities, but actually, Mr. Speaker, ours is a region of two dozen livable communities. Under Oregon's unique land use system, each community is encouraged to develop its own special identity.

One of the unique places that deserves special attention is the city of Milwaukie, Oregon, as it now celebrates its centennial this month, an example that thousands of small communities across the country could look to. Milwaukie's hard-working citizens are keenly interested in making the next 100 years something that is even better.

The community of Milwaukie has played a key role in the history of our

State. The city was actually settled in 1840 and played a critical role in shipping up and down the Willamette River. The commerce from those docks served to link Willamette Valley's pioneers with goods from the Hudson's Bay Trading Company and beyond. Oregon's founder, Dr. John McLaughlin, often supervised commerce on those very docks when he visited from his nearby home. Today, Milwaukie is the second largest city in fast-growing Clackamas County. It serves the Portland region as a transportation hub, hosting the intersection of two State highways and two freight railroads. But it is how Milwaukie has approached the future that is intriguing to me.

In the latter part of the 1990s, this city looked at how they were going to join the region's light rail system. Some had serious questions about what it would do to their community and how it was going to be compatible with how they wanted to grow with the rest of the region. Instead of joining the region's light rail system at that point, they took time out to reflect how they should grow and relate to the surrounding communities. In the course of the next 5 years, the community carried out literally thousands of hours of community meetings. Some were informal. There were scores of neighborhood association meetings and workshops.

As a result of this searching and introspection, the community, its neighborhoods and elected leaders, including some who were the most skeptical of earlier plans, are now among the most active and aggressive advocates of rail coming to their town; and not only light rail, but they are also supporting an innovative commuter rail system serving Milwaukie, as well. They are looking at other ways to make their community livable.

Milwaukie, Oregon, like so many communities across the country, made decisions early in its career that cut off its waterfront from the community. It is inaccessible now because of a State highway that makes pedestrian and other access impossible. This beautiful and historic resource is now out of their reach, home only to a treatment plant. Milwaukie residents are now working to overcome this barrier to connect their historic waterfront and natural resource with the heart of their downtown.

Milwaukie, Oregon is an outstanding example of how a livable community grapples with issues of growth, transportation, development, its past and its future. It is a community that other cities can look to for inspiration, how people of strong and varying opinions sitting down and working through their issues together for the common good can make a city safer, healthier and more economically secure.

I, for one, am proud to represent the "City of Dogwoods" as it celebrates its centennial. Congratulations, Milwaukie, Oregon.

CONGRATULATING THE M. ENSEMBLE COMPANY FOR ITS UPCOMING "MEDAL OF HONOR THEATER PROJECT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the M. Ensemble Company for its upcoming "Medal of Honor Theater Project," which honors the life and service of the first black soldier ever awarded the Medal of Honor for his heroism during the Vietnam War.

I would like to especially thank fellow Miamians Patricia E. Williams and Shirley Richardson who are cofounders of the M. Ensemble Company for all of their leadership and dedication to this praiseworthy organization. For more than 30 years, the theater company has been providing training and career-building opportunities for the south Florida community. This recognition is especially fitting as our country celebrates the countless African American contributions to our rich history.

Please join me in congratulating the M. Ensemble Company and its Medal of Honor project for its tremendous tribute to the cause of arts and learning for all.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

O powerful and ever-living God, the lasting health of all who believe in You, hear our prayer on this World Day for the Sick.

In accepting our sufferings and our human limitations, Lord, You teach us the virtue of patience. We offer our prayers for our sick brothers and sisters, especially those who are near and dear to the Members of Congress.

On this special day we give You thanks for all those in health care ministry on every continent. Continue to call forth men and women of science and faith who will serve the weakest members of society as professionals in research, in medicine, and in health care. Sustain them and guide them

until that final moment when You bring Your people to glory in Your presence forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FEENEY of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO SUSAN B. ANTHONY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the birthday of a great woman in the history of the United States, Susan B. Anthony.

Susan B. Anthony is known not only for her fight to gain women the right to vote, but also for her great courage in the stand against abortion. She was a feminist who fought tirelessly to protect the dignity of motherhood, which she believed to be an inherent right of all women.

Susan B. Anthony saw abortion as a grave offense against human dignity. I am proud to honor Susan B. Anthony for her dedication to the cause of life, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in this.

HONORING KAVI VYAS

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kavi Vyas, a senior at Rancho Alamitos High School in Garden Grove, for his achievements in both athletics and in community service.

Kavi was named the male recipient of the Fall CIF Spirit of Sport Award. The male and female recipients of this prestigious award are selected out of 1,200 nominated California high school athletes. The CIF Spirit Awards are given to student athletes who have demonstrated sportsmanship and who are leaders in their communities.

In addition to excelling in athletics and in the community, he is also active in his school as president of the Junior Statesmen of America, former vice

president of the National Honor Society, and is currently a member of the California Scholarship Federation.

I am very proud of Kavi. Accomplishing so much at such a young age is truly impressive, and I wish him continued success for the future.

CLONING

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last year, we in the House of Representatives voted to ban all cloning of humans. Tinkering with human life the way some propose to do is unethical, immoral, and wrong. It would treat little human beings as commodities to be created, experimented on, used, and destroyed.

Of course, some people, like the Raelian cult, want to create clones and let them grow up. That too is wrong. There should be no cloning of humans at all.

Let me read what Ronald Reagan had to say about the sanctity of life: "Every legislator, every doctor, and every citizen needs to recognize that the real issue is whether to affirm and protect the sanctity of all human life, or to embrace a social ethic where some human lives are valued and others are not. As a Nation, we must choose between the sanctity of life ethic and the quality of life ethic."

Soon, Congress will be asked to choose between protecting some human lives and protecting all human lives. I pray we do the right thing.

TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE TAITAGUE

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a 5-year-old girl from Guam. Her name is Justice Taitague, and she passed away Sunday evening.

Justice suffered from leukemia. Her best chance for life was a marrow transplant. Through the efforts of Dr. Thomas Shieh, president of the Guam Medical Society, and the Hawaiian Bone Marrow Donor Registry and the National Marrow Donor program, the first-ever marrow drive on Guam was held. This "Drive for Justice" registered 3,400 donors in 3 days.

Together with the people of Guam, I extend my deepest sympathy to the family of Justice Taitague. Our hearts and our prayers are with her parents, Lynn and Anthony.

National Donor Day is this Friday, Valentine's Day. There is still a critical need for donors from the Asian, Pacific Islander, and other minority communities. Give the gift of life. Join the registry. Because of Justice, many others will now have life.

HONORING JAY TAYLOR'S SERVICE TO MANCHESTER

(Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jay Taylor upon his retirement from the position of economic development director for the city of Manchester, New Hampshire.

Jay's tireless efforts to revitalize the Queen City's economic base have proved successful, as evidenced by Manchester's booming downtown and night life. Ten years ago, New Hampshire's largest city and financial center faced a deep recession and a bleak economic future. Today, Manchester boasts a new arena, an expanding airport, and a reenergized night life of new shops and restaurants due, in large part, to Jay's hard work.

Without Jay's guidance and keen business savvy, Manchester would not be the prosperous economic heart of New Hampshire that it is today. Manchester and the State of New Hampshire are fortunate to have dedicated individuals like Jay working to make this city and this State a great place to live and do business.

CHALLENGES FOR SECRETARY POWELL

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, one of the challenges Secretary Powell faces is the growing isolation of Germany and France from their European allies.

NATO nations voted 16 to 3 to support the defense of Turkey, our democratic ally. I worry about Germany's growing anti-Turkish policy, first to oppose Turkey's EU membership and now to oppose defending the Turkish democracy.

I worry for France. Tens of thousands of Britons, Canadians, and Americans fought to free France. Now France stands for the principle that democracies should be distracted from dictators.

The French Government, one wag said, they are always there when they need you.

RECOGNIZING CROSSWINDS YOUTH SERVICES

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Crosswinds Youth Services, a nonprofit organization in my congressional district that has served Florida's Space Coast for the past 28 years.

Yesterday, February 10, Crosswinds Youth Services received the prestigious

National Network for Youth Agency of the Year Award, and I am proud to recognize their outstanding achievement.

The National Network for Youth states in its award letter: "It is truly a great honor that Crosswinds Youth Services this year has been judged to be the best organization in the Nation serving runaway, homeless, and other youth in crisis. This award goes to the best among the best in America. Crosswinds is the first organization in Florida to win this award."

According to the National Network for Youth, each year in America, 5,000 runaways die from assault, illness, and suicide.

Crosswinds is an extraordinary organization doing extraordinary work. The men and women involved in this organization need to be commended, and I am honored to rise in support of them on this day.

CONFRONTING THREATS TOGETHER

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in Brussels today, the North Atlantic Council of the NATO Alliance continues to deliberate on a matter that has potentially grave consequences for the alliance. France, Germany, and Belgium have blocked the consultation and planning for the defense of Turkey, which that country has requested by the unprecedented invocation of article IV of the NATO Treaty.

At best, it would inexcusably delay planning for the defense of an ally, possibly leading to an avoidable loss of life should Turkey come under attack. At worst, it means the very end of the alliance, as its core mutual defense guarantee would be exposed as nothing more than empty words from the French, German, and Belgian governments.

No longer is this a question of whether authorizing NATO planning somehow signals a decision to use military force against Iraq. This was the argument used by the three allies on Monday when they blocked a response to Turkey's article IV request.

Should France, Germany, and Belgium continue to object to prudent contingency planning to deter or to defend against a possible threat to Turkey, the core collective-defense commitment of the alliance will be called into doubt.

This Member hopes that President Chirac, Chancellor Schroder, and Prime Minister Verhofstadt recognize that this is no longer an Iraq question. This is no longer a U.N. question. This is now a question about whether the 19 NATO allies will fulfill their solemn treaty commitments.

□ 1415

HONORING CROSSWINDS YOUTH SERVICES

(Mr. FEENEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague from Florida in recognizing Crosswinds in Brevard County, Florida.

President Bush reminds us that America is a great, compassionate nation, and there is no better example than Crosswinds, which serves the youth and the teenagers and runaways that come to our community. They have won the prestigious National Network for Youth Award, and we are very proud of them.

I was especially proud to be there as Boeing employees, who contributed huge amounts of their own dollars voluntarily opened the Boeing room at this fine facility. I was also proud to lead the Duck Race this year, where we raised money by floating some 10,000 ducks over the Intercoastal River. I will tell you that the fine people who lead this organization, including Jan Lokay, Jim Ross, Cynthia Handley and many, many others really care deeply about children.

Finally, I want to recognize the young children that are working hard to turn their lives around for a better future, Mr. Speaker. There is no better example of President Bush's call for American compassionate leadership than Crosswinds in Brevard County.

CONDEMNING LIBYA'S INVOLVE- MENT IN THE UNITED NATION'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

(Mrs. MUSGRAVE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong objection and even my disgust at the recent selection of Libya as the Chair of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

It is shameful and it defies logic for Libya to sit in judgment of any nation on the critical issue of human rights. Libya is widely known to be a sponsor of international terrorism and an abuser of the most basic human rights. The American people will never forget that the Libyan terrorists were the ones who hijacked Pan Am Flight 103 and murdered hundreds of innocent passengers.

Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that the only thing Libya knows about human rights is how to abuse them. Any notion that a terrorist nation such as Libya should lead any commission on human rights is absolutely repugnant.

Mr. Speaker, our President has made it very clear, the United Nations has some important decisions to make that will determine whether or not the

United Nations will be relevant in the world community. One of these decisions is whether or not they will allow a terrorist state and a human rights abuser like Libya to chair the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, we represent a country founded on the principles of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We should not, and I pray we will not, use taxpayers' dollars to support any commission chaired by a nation with such an outrageous record on human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning Libya's involvement with the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

LIBYA'S BLATANT DISREGARD FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

(Mr. PUTNAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, as the United Nations charges towards irrelevance, we have this latest news that Libya has been selected to become Chair of the United Nations Commission on Rights.

Libya continues to be a blatant violator of human rights and remains on our own State Department's list of state sponsors of terror. Libya's totalitarian regime under Muammar Qadhafi has been a leading state sponsor of terrorism, including on November 13 the German court which convicted a Libyan national for the bombing in 1986 of the La Belle disco in Berlin; and the court further declared that there was clear evidence of responsibility of the Libyan Government for the bombing. Additionally, Libya was responsible for the explosion of Pan American Airline Flight 103 that crashed in Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 259 passengers and crew and 11 citizens on the ground.

To add insult to injury in this latest mockery of the United Nations, Iraq is in line to chair the United Nations Conference on Disarmament later this year.

Mr. Speaker, the world needs a credible spokesman for human rights and democratic values. The ascension of Libya to chair this body and the ascension of Iraq to chair the Conference on Disarmament make a further mockery of the Commission and the entire United Nations.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 7, 2003 at 1:43 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits the Economic Report of the President and the 2003 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-2)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT
TRANSMITTED TO THE CONGRESS,
FEBRUARY 2003, TOGETHER WITH THE
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF
ECONOMIC ADVISERS

To the Congress of the United States:

The economy is recovering from the effects of the slowdown that began in the middle of 2000 and led to the subsequent recession. The American economy has been hit hard by the events of the past three years, most tragically by the effects of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Our economy and investor confidence were hurt when we learned that some corporate leaders were not playing by the rules. The combined impact of these events, along with the three-year decline in stock values that impacted business investment, slowed growth in 2002. Despite these challenges, the economy's underlying fundamentals remain solid—including low inflation, low interest rates, and strong productivity gains. Yet the pace of the expansion has not been satisfactory; there are still too many Americans looking for jobs. We will not be satisfied until every part of our economy is vigorous and every person who wants a job can find one.

We are taking action to restore the robust growth that creates jobs. In January, I proposed a growth and jobs plan to add needed momentum to our economic recovery. We will accelerate the tax relief already approved by Congress and give it to Americans now, when it is most needed. Lowering tax rates and moving more Americans into the lowest tax bracket will help our economy grow and create jobs. Faster marriage tax relief and a faster increase in the child tax credit will especially help middle-class families, and should take effect now. We will take steps to encourage small business investment, helping them to expand and create jobs. We will end the unfair double taxation of corporate income received by individuals. By putting more money back in the hands of share-

holders, strengthening investor confidence in the market, and encouraging more investment, we will have more growth and job creation. These steps will allow Americans to keep more of their own money to spend, save, or invest. They will boost the economy, ensure that the recovery continues, and provide long-term economic benefits through higher productivity and higher incomes.

As our economy recovers, we also have an obligation to help Americans who have lost their jobs. That is why we extended unemployment payments for workers who lost their jobs and improved incentives for investment to create new jobs. I also proposed a bold new program of reemployment accounts to help workers searching for jobs.

Our commitment to a strong economy does not stop with these important steps. We will continue to strengthen investor confidence in the integrity of our markets. We will develop better ways to train workers for new jobs. We will make the Nation's regulations and tax code less onerous and more reflective of the demands of a dynamic economy, and expand opportunities for open trade and stronger growth in all nations, especially for emerging and developing economies.

Our Nation's economic progress comes from the innovation and hard work of Americans in a free market that creates opportunities no other system can offer. Government does not create wealth, but instead creates the economic environment in which risk takers and entrepreneurs create jobs. With the right policies focused on growth and jobs, strong economic fundamentals—and hard work—I am confident we will extend economic opportunity and prosperity to every corner of America.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2003.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

CONDEMNING THE SELECTION OF LIBYA TO CHAIR THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) condemning the selection of Libya to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 27

Whereas on January 20, 2003, Libya, a gross violator of human rights and state sponsor of terrorism, was elected to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights ("Commission"), a body charged with the responsibility of promoting universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all;

Whereas according to the rotation system which governs the selection of the Executive Board of the Commission, 2003 was designated as the year for the Africa Group to chair the Commission, and the Africa Group selected Libya as its candidate;

Whereas South Africa's Democratic Alliance spokeswoman, Dene Smuts, was quoted by the British Broadcasting Corporation as saying that the South African Government's decision to support Libya's election was an insult to human rights and that African countries "should have supported a candidate of whom all Africans could be proud";

Whereas Amnesty International has repeatedly documented that Libya's human rights situation continues to seriously deteriorate with gross violations taking place systematically, extrajudicial execution used against government opponents, and political detainees routinely tortured physically and psychologically during interrogation, with some detainees dying in custody as a result;

Whereas Human Rights Watch recently underscored that "[o]ver the past three decades, Libya's human rights record has been appalling" and "Libya has been a closed country for United Nations and nongovernmental human rights investigators";

Whereas Human Rights Watch further stated that "Libya's election poses a real test for the Commission . . . [r]epressive governments must not be allowed to hijack the U.N. human rights system";

Whereas the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights stated that "the Government of Libya should not be entrusted by the United Nations to lead its international effort to promote human rights around the world";

Whereas Freedom House declared that "[a] country [such as Libya] with such a gross record of human rights abuses should not direct the proceedings of the UN's main human rights monitoring body . . . [t]his will undermine the UN's moral authority and send a strong and clear message to fellow rights violators that they are in the clear";

Whereas on November 13, 2001, a German court convicted a Libyan national for the bombing in 1986 of the La Belle disco in Berlin, in which two United States servicemen were killed, and the court further declared that there was clear evidence of responsibility of the Libyan Government for the bombing;

Whereas Libya was responsible for the December 21, 1988, explosion of Pan American Airline Flight 103 en route from London to New York that crashed in Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 259 passengers and crew, and 11 others on the ground;

Whereas a French court convicted six Libyan Government officials in absentia for the bombing of UTA Flight 772 over Niger in 1989;

Whereas United Nations Resolution 748 of March 31, 1992, imposed an arms and air embargo on Libya and established a United Nations Security Council sanctions committee to address measures against Libya;

Whereas United Nations Resolution 883 of November 11, 1993, tightened sanctions on Libya, including the freezing of Libyan funds and financial resources in third countries, and banned the provision to Libya of equipment for oil refining and transportation;

Whereas United Nations Resolution 1192 of August 27, 1998, reaffirmed that the measures

set forth in previous resolutions remain in effect and binding on all member states, and further expressed the intention of the United Nations to consider additional measures if the accused individuals for Pan Am Flight 103 and UTA Flight 772 bombings had not arrived or appeared for trial promptly in accordance with paragraph 8 of the Resolution;

Whereas in January 2001 a three-judge Scottish court sitting in the Netherlands found Libyan Abdel Basset al-Megrahi guilty of the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, sentenced him to life imprisonment, and said it accepted evidence that he was a member of Libya's Jamahariya Security Organization, and in March 2002 Scottish appeal judges in the Netherlands upheld his conviction;

Whereas as recently as January 12, 2003, Libyan leader, Moammar Gaddafi, in an interview with Newsweek- Washington Post reporter, Lally Weymouth, failed to accept responsibility for the attack and had the audacity of calling for the United States to share the burden of compensation;

Whereas Libya remains on the Department of State's list of state-sponsors of terrorism;

Whereas the United States found the selection of Libya to chair the Commission to be an affront to international human rights efforts and, in particular, to victims of Libya's repression and Libyan-sponsored terrorism, and therefore broke with precedent and called for a recorded vote on Libya's chairmanship;

Whereas Canada and one other country joined the United States in voting against Libya and 17 other countries abstained;

Whereas the European Union's common position was to abstain from the vote objecting to Libya's selection as chair of the Commission;

Whereas 33 countries ignored Libya's record on human rights and status as a country subject to United Nations sanctions for the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 and voted for Libya to lead the Commission;

Whereas the majority of these countries are United States foreign aid recipients;

Whereas the selection of Libya to chair the Commission is but the most recent example of a malaise plaguing the Commission, whereby its credibility has been called into question in recent years as its membership ranks have swelled with other egregious human rights violators;

Whereas the United States' challenge is part of a broader effort to reform the Commission, reclaim it from the oppressors, and ensure that it fulfills its mandate;

Whereas on January 20, 2003, Ambassador Kevin Moley, United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, emphasized that "[w]e seek to actively engage and strengthen the moral authority of the Commission on Human Rights, so that it once again proves itself a forceful advocate for those in need of having their human rights protected . . . [w]e are convinced that the best way for the Commission to ensure the ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights over the long-term is to have a membership comprised of countries with strong human rights records at home";

Whereas a majority of the 53 member states of the Commission are participants in the Community of Democracies and signed the Seoul Declaration of November 12, 2002, calling upon democratic nations to work together to uphold the principles of democracy, freedom, good governance, and accountability in international organizations;

Whereas the participants in the Seoul Ministerial meeting of the Community of Democracies issued a Statement on Terrorism in which they "strongly denounced terrorism as a grave threat to democratic societies and the values they embrace . . . [they] re-

affirmed that terrorism constitutes a threat to international peace and security as well as to humanity in general and indeed to the very foundation on which democracies are built . . . [and] [t]he most recent terrorist attacks confirm that international cooperation against terrorism will remain a long-term effort and requires a sustained universal commitment"; and

Whereas although United Nations sanctions against Libya have been suspended, the sanctions remain in effect, and Libya's continued status as an international outlaw nation and its continued unwillingness to accept responsibility for its terrorist actions should bar it from consideration as a candidate for membership in the United Nations Security Council or any other United Nations entity or affiliated agency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the selection of Libya to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights ("Commission") ;

(2) commends the President and the Administration for the principled position of the United States in objecting to and calling for a vote on Libya's chairmanship of the Commission;

(3) commends countries which joined the United States in objecting to Libya's selection as chair of the Commission;

(4) expresses its dismay at the European Union common position of abstention on the critical vote over Libya's chairmanship;

(5) is appalled at the support provided to Libya in its efforts to lead the Commission;

(6) will hold accountable countries who voted in favor of Libya's chairmanship;

(7) highlights its grave concern over the continuing efforts of human rights violators and terrorist countries to use international fora to legitimize their regimes and continue to act with impunity, and calls on the President to raise United States objections to such efforts during bilateral and multilateral discussions and to direct pertinent Cabinet secretaries to do the same;

(8) calls on countries at various stages of democratization to demonstrate their commitment to human rights, democracy, peace and security, and support efforts to reform the Commission;

(9) calls on the President to instruct the Secretary of State to consult with the appropriate congressional committees, within 30 calendar days of adoption of this resolution, regarding the United States priorities and strategy for the 59th session of the Commission on Human Rights and strategy and proposals for reform of the Commission;

(10) calls on the President to issue an objection to the continued suspension of sanctions against Libya and to call for their full reinstatement until Libya publicly accepts responsibility for the Pan Am Flight 103 bombing, provides appropriate compensation to the victims, and is in full compliance with all of the other requirements of the United Nations sanctions imposed as a result of Libya's orchestration of the Pan Am 103 terrorist attack; and

(11) calls on the Secretary of State to engage member countries to support United States efforts to ensure that states that are gross violators of human rights, sponsors of terrorist activities, or subject to United Nations sanctions will not be elected to leadership positions in the United Nations General Assembly nor will they be elected to membership or leadership positions on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations Security Council, or any other United Nations entity or affiliated agency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Il-

linois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 27, the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan measure, condemning the selection of Libya as the Chair of United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Despite the best efforts of the United States and a handful of other countries, Libya was elected to this position on January 20 of this year. For a country whose own human rights record will not stand up to scrutiny, Libya is certainly in no position to stand in judgment of any other country. Virtually every human rights organization has condemned Libya's flagrant disregard for human rights and the rule of law. Unfortunately, some 17 countries abstained in the vote for the Commission's Chair, including all of the members of the European Union, who choose to look the other way and let Libya attain this coveted post.

How is it that a country such as Libya will soon be in a position to control the proceedings of the U.N.'s main human rights monitoring body?

Historically, the chairmanship of the commission rotates among the major regional groupings in the U.N. system. This year the opportunity to nominate a candidate fell to the Africa group which selected Libya as Africa's candidate. Their selection was primarily in recognition of financial support Libya provided toward the establishing a new Africa union to succeed the ineffective Organization for African Unity. It is also due in part to Libya's backing of the new African Partnership for Development, an initiative led by African states such as South Africa, Nigeria and Senegal, that calls for increased trade benefits and debt relief from the West in exchange for commitments to promote human rights and good governance across the continent.

Needless to say, Libya's central role in these initiatives will undermine their credibility. According to Human Rights Watch, "Over the past 3 decades, Libya's human rights record has been appalling and Libya has been a closed country for United Nations and nongovernmental human rights investigators."

Freedom House declared that Libya's chairmanship would "undermine the U.N.'s moral authority and send a strong and clear message to fellow

rights violators that they are in the clear.' We do not have to go any further than the most recent State Department Human Rights Report to learn that Libya's extensive security forces continue to commit numerous serious human rights abuses.

Qadhafi uses summary judicial proceedings to suppress domestic opposition, and torture is used as a punishment and during interrogations. With prisoners held incommunicado, many political detainees are held for years without charge. Libya's government restricts freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion. Violence against women is a widespread problem, as is the use of forced labor and repression against key tribal groups. In short, Libya's record should disqualify it from membership in the 53-member commission, not to speak of any claim it might have to chair its proceedings.

We are well aware that Libya has yet to clear its name in connection with the 1988 terrorist bombing of Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, which killed 270 people. Although one of two former Libyan intelligence agents was convicted in the case 2 years ago and the conviction was upheld on appeal, Qadhafi continues to deny all responsibility for the bombing and has yet to pay compensation to the surviving family members to the victims of that terrorist attack.

While temporarily suspended, U.N. sanctions as a result of the Pan Am 103 bombing remain applicable against Libya, whose continuing status as an outlaw nation should bar it from consideration as a candidate for membership in the U.N. Security Council or any other U.N. body. The very credibility of the United Nations has been called into question with this Libyan selection.

The United States will obviously have no easy task in reforming the Commission, ensuring that it fulfills the ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The place to begin, in my view, is to ensure that the Commission has a membership comprised of countries with strong human rights records.

□ 1430

It should, for example, include participants in the community of democracies who have signed the Seoul declaration of November 2002, calling upon democratic nations to work together to uphold the principles of democracy, freedom, good government, and accountability in international organizations.

I look forward to consulting with the Secretary of State on our priorities of strategy for the upcoming 59th session of the commission and for its long-term reform and renewal.

I would also call upon the President to resist any effort now to lift U.N. sanctions against Libya until that country publicly accepts responsibility for the Pan Am 103 bombing, provides appropriate compensation to the vic-

tims, and is otherwise in full compliance with all the requirements of the United Nations sanctions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 27.

Mr. Speaker, this important resolution condemns in the strongest possible terms the absurd selection of Libya as Chair of this year's United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by expressing my sincere gratitude to my colleagues across the aisle, our distinguished Committee on International Relations chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, for collaborating with us on the text of this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Colonel Muammar el-Gaddafi's Orwellian regime, a state sponsor of terrorism and a gross violator of human rights under United Nations sanctions, was elected by member states to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, a body charged with responsibility for promoting universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. This, Mr. Speaker, is the ultimate theater of the absurd.

By virtue of its position in the Africa group of member states in the United Nations, Libya emerged as the pre-ordained Chair of the U.N. human rights commission.

Traditionally, Mr. Speaker, this post has rotated among the U.N.'s geographic groups, with each group respecting the other's nominee without a challenge. Realizing that the Africa group's turn was due and that, appallingly, Libya would be its choice, our administration took the unprecedented step of breaking with tradition and challenging Libya's nomination.

It was the right move, Mr. Speaker. The United States cannot stand idly by as monstrous abusers of human rights such as Libya hijack the human rights commission.

Given the absurd realities of the United Nations in so many instances, our protest was too little, too late, and Libya survived the challenge. Only Canada and Peru had the courage to stand by us in standing up to this outrage.

Although this piece of legislation focuses on the selection of Libya to chair the human rights commission, it is also relevant to a similar outrage which we learned about only recently. Because of an absurd alphabetical rotation scheme, Saddam Hussein's Iraq is set to assume the presidency of the United Nations Conference on Disarmament for a 30-day term starting on May 1. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, this is

Saddam Hussein's reward for 13 years of success in his efforts to defeat U.N. sanctions and inspectors by rebuilding his capacity to create mass havoc with chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, in response to these twin outrages, many of my colleagues here today will no doubt argue that enough is enough and conclude that it is time to pull the plug in our participation of such U.N. agencies. I fully understand their sentiment, but as we have seen in the current Iraq crisis, the U.N. is both a reality and, to some extent, a necessity. We cannot solve all of the world's problems without a forum to discuss our differences and hopefully to coordinate our responses.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that H. Con. Res. 27, the first piece of foreign policy legislation to be considered by the 108th Congress, will be remembered as a watershed event in our efforts to reclaim the United Nations human rights commission and other hopelessly misguided institutions from the rogue states which have captured them for their own propaganda purposes.

This resolution is only a first step. We must follow up with a multipronged effort to bolster U.S. leadership at the U.N. and to reform its membership and leadership criteria.

First, Mr. Speaker, we have to increase the capacity of our State Department to engage in multilateral diplomacy. Our diplomats have to become more effective in lobbying other governments to vote with the United States on critical matters at the U.N.

The United States must also engage in a vigorous and sustained effort to establish and to build a new democracy caucus within the U.N. that will assist democratic nations to work within and across regional lines to promote democratic leadership within the U.N. system.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we need to engage in a comprehensive effort to reform the outmoded system of regional voting and decision-making, and we must challenge rotational alphabetical and other leadership schemes that permit nations under U.N. sanctions to assume leadership positions at the United Nations.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure and to continue to work toward a more rational, sane, and effective United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

As we have heard, Mr. Speaker, on January 20 of this year, Libya, a gross violator of human rights and a state sponsor of terrorism, was elected to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights despite the Bush administration's best effort to block this

farce. Hiding behind procedural explanations and diplomatic maneuverings, 33 countries ignored Libya's use of terror, extrajudicial killings, arbitrary arrests, persecution and harassments of political opponents, the selling of human beings into bondage as slaves; and instead, they voted for Libya to preside over this foremost human rights body.

The commission is one of the few international forums confronting human rights violators, and it sets much of the tone and the agenda for a global human rights accountability. Its mission essentially is to give voice to those who are oppressed; thus, the selection of Libya was not only a defeat for justice and human dignity but a betrayal of all those brave souls worldwide who risk imprisonment, exile or even death to fight for universal rights and for fundamental freedoms.

It was, and is, a betrayal of millions upon millions living under brutal regimes from North Korea to Cuba to China to Vietnam to Iran and Iraq. It is a betrayal also of the suffering endured by the families of the victims of Pan Am Flight 103. It shows contempt for the mission and work of the commission, and it only serves to empower and embolden pariah states who are increasing their presence on the commission and manipulating its agenda in order to legitimize their unacceptable practices.

How can a regime which does not allow U.N. human rights monitors into its borders and refuses to comply with its obligation under international human rights covenants be a member of the commission, much less be elected to preside over it? How can a nation subject to U.N. sanctions for its role in terrorist attacks be rewarded with a leadership position such as this?

Enough is enough. The U.S. cannot and will not sit idly by and allow dictators and terrorist states to further hijack the commission and other U.N. bodies.

That is why the resolution before us, which I had the pleasure of drafting with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), our ranking member, not only provides overwhelming evidence about Libya's record on human rights and terrorism but gives direction and support to the Bush administration as it attempts to reclaim the commission from the tyrants.

Toward this goal, we look forward to continuing our discussions with the administration on such possible areas of reform such as the establishment of at least a minimum set of standards which should be met by all states who seek to be members of this body; also, the creation of a democracy caucus where its members make decisions based on shared values and commitments, rather than regional or bilateral considerations; to establish cri-

teria for accreditation of nongovernmental organizations to the commission, to make sure that these NGOs are not agents of violator governments; also, to provide recognized prisoners of conscience and human right dissidents in exile an opportunity to render testimony on the situation of their country of origin during debate of pertinent resolutions at the annual session of the commission.

This resolution extends beyond the commission. It seeks to prevent a repetition of this unacceptable situation in other U.N. fora, forums such as the Conference on Disarmament which may have Iraq at its helm in May of this year. And to achieve these goals, Mr. Speaker, the resolution calls for a diplomatic initiative to ensure that states that are gross violators of human rights, sponsors of terrorist activities or subject to U.N. sanctions, they will not be afforded membership or elected to any leadership position on any non-General Assembly U.N. entity or affiliated agency.

Article V, in fact, of the U.N. charter provides, in principle, the suspension of a member state's rights if it is subject to U.N. sanctions. In addition, the resolution seeks to address attempts made by the Libyan dictator to escape his regime's responsibility for the Pan Am 103 bombing. It calls on the President to seek full reinstatement of sanctions against Libya until it is in full compliance with all of its obligations under these sanctions, sanctions which were imposed, Mr. Speaker, as a result of Libya's orchestration of this terrorist attack.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this is a comprehensive, forward-looking resolution which seeks to restore the commission's moral authority as well as the relevance of other U.N. bodies so they may fulfill their mandates. It enjoys bipartisan support, and I ask my colleagues to vote for passage of this resolution today.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield as much time as he might consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip, one of the most effective global fighters for human rights in this body or any place.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is very kind, and I thank him for his remarks; but more than that, I thank him for his leadership on this issue and so many issues of vital concern to human rights internationally.

I also want to thank my very good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman. He himself is a giant in standing up for human rights. He and I have traveled overseas and participated in the Helsinki process together, he chairing delegations on which I had the honor of serving with him.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friends, the gentleman from Illi-

nois and the gentleman from California, for bringing this very important resolution to the House floor. It is, I believe, a moral imperative and a matter of principle that this House speak as one today.

The selection on January 20 of Libya, a gross, and I have heard that word used a number of times, and in our own lexicon of law "gross" means beyond the pale, a gross violator of human rights and a state sponsor of terrorism to ironically chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights is, in my opinion, an affront to basic decency and it demeans the United Nations itself.

Absurd, grotesque, tragic. Those are just a few of the words that have been used to describe Libya's election to this post. Our State Department includes Libya on its list of state sponsors of terrorism. Amnesty International has documented Libya's extrajudicial execution of government opponents and torture of political detainees. Human Rights Watch has called Libya's human rights record over the last three decades appalling.

Imagine, the Commission on Human Rights, which claims to stand for free elections, free expression and fair trials, will now be chaired by a Nation that has not had a free election since Colonel Qaddafi seized power in 1969. Imagine, the Commission on Human Rights will now be chaired by a nation that itself refuses, refuses to admit U.N. human rights investigators. Imagine, the Commission on Human Rights will now be chaired by a nation that was responsible for the 1988 bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 that killed 270 people, and they harbored for years and years the perpetrators of that act; responsible for the 1986 bombing of La Belle Disco in Berlin that killed two U.S. servicemen; and for the 1989 bombing of UTA Flight 772 over Niger.

The selection of Libya to head the Commission on Human Rights undermines the credibility, integrity, and relevance of the United Nations. We must not, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we must not countenance or ignore or rationalize the dangerous, illegal and destabilizing behavior by criminals and nations whose rogue status endangers international security and stability.

The only bright spot in this otherwise outrageous, dismal act is that it may, it just may spur the international community to closely scrutinize Libya's human rights record and force serious thinking about reforming the Commission and the way of selecting the Commission. I urge our government, Mr. Speaker, to work to accomplish both of those ends.

I believe this resolution is an important step in focusing our attention on this egregious act of irresponsibility by the United Nations and by its member states, and I urge my colleagues to support unanimously this very important resolution.

Again, I thank the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois,

and my friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding me this time and for their leadership in this effort.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say what a pleasure it is to work with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on important issues such as these. They are immensely helpful and, as I say, are a real pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to echo the words of my good friend from Illinois. It is a pleasure and an honor to begin yet another session of Congress with him. We look forward to achieving many things together.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express my grave concerns with the content of the resolution condemning the election of Libya to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

I abhor Libya's human rights record. I don't agree with Libya's selection to head the Commission. But, the members of the United Nations have held a legitimate, democratic vote. Despite our serious reservations we have a responsible obligation to abide by the U.N.'s decision. We should not, as this resolution calls for, hold nations accountable for their votes.

In a straight up or down vote, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights voted to elect Libya as its chair. Many people don't agree with that decision—Members of Congress, human rights advocates and many others. There is clear evidence of Libya's state sponsorship of terrorism and it's human rights record. Yet, regardless of our distaste with the outcome, this was a fair election in which the member nations elected Libya to this post. Everyone involved had an opportunity to vote and a majority decided who they wanted to lead them. Democracy has prevailed. Now, the U.S. Congress is asked to vote to condemn that practice of democracy?

The United States should practice what it preaches. We cannot in one breath say democracy is good and in the next say democracy is bad, simply because we disagree with the result.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 1988 Pan Am Flight 103 exploded in the skies over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 270 innocent people. Sadly, the government that sponsored this terrorist act only fifteen years ago—Libya—has now been selected to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Unfortunately, the hypocrisy of this reaches far beyond the Pan Am tragedy. Libya continues to stand in consistent violation of international human rights treaties. It's not just that torture and random executions are not condemned by Libya, such gross violations of human rights are heavily practiced and supported by high ranking government officials.

Libyans—especially those that freely express their political opinion—live in fear of their own government every day. Torture, abuse and unfair detentions are common practice within the Libyan system of justice, yet Libya has not admitted to a single case of human rights abuses within their country.

The preamble of the United Nations' Charter appropriately states: "We the peoples of the United Nations determined to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights." As Libya assumes the chair of the U.N.'s Commission on Human Rights, it is clear that this faith has been seriously compromised.

It is appalling that a nation with a clear and consistent record of complete disregard for human rights now stands in this key role in helping combat human rights violations. I believe that the legitimacy of this Commission has been lost and thousands of innocent men and women across the world, who fall victim to harsh and unfair treatment every day, will continue to suffer without hope as long as nations like Libya lead the fight to protect human rights by chairing this commission.

I join my colleagues in supporting H. Con. Res. 27, which condemns the selection of Libya to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of abominations like Libya's recent election to chair the Human Rights Commission, it's plain that the U.N. has tripped over the final precipice and is now descending ever-deeper into the abyss of moral relativism.

We've seen from the U.N., for decades, a flagrant pattern of amoral accommodation, calculated appeasement, and even the willful suppression of the distinction between good and evil itself.

We see a disturbing lesson at work: In the United Nations of the Twenty-First Century, a documented record of state-sponsored terrorism, aggressive militarism and systematic brutality are no impediment to a country's rise within the U.N.'s bureaucratic hierarchy. From the International Criminal Court's excesses, to Iraq's chairmanship of the disarmament conference, and Libya's chairmanship of the Human Rights Commission, the U.N. is utterly marginalizing itself.

The free world can't delegate international security decisions to an organization capable of absurd actions like the elevation of Libya to the Human Rights Commission or Iraq to the Disarmament Conference.

Let's not hedge the truth: The U.N. is legitimizing indefensible regimes and at the end of this path lays utter irrelevance. The free nations of the world face a number of grave problems and we can never allow illegitimate regimes to dictate the terms of our freedom or security.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest possible terms the selection of Libya to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Libya has committed untold acts of terror against the United States and its citizens. Libya has not demonstrated sufficiently that it does not support international terrorism. Nor has it abandoned its quest for weapons of mass destruction. Congress correctly extended the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act until August 2006.

To be sure, let's look at Libya's record of uncivilized behavior during the last two decades: In the 1980s it was reported that Libya used chemical weapons against government rebels in the Chad civil war. It was also reported that during this time Libya was seeking chemical and nuclear weapons. Muammar al-Qadhafi also stated that he supported international terrorism, and defended terrorism in wars of national liberation. Because of this support, the

United States named Libya a state sponsor of terrorism on December 29, 1979.

Libya was suspected of being involved in the April 5, 1986 bombing of a Berlin nightclub frequented by U.S. Armed forces personnel. Three U.S. soldiers died in the blast. On April 15, 1986 the United States bombed three target areas in Libya in retaliation for the Berlin incident.

The United States and the United Kingdom accused Libya of complicity in the December 21, 1988 explosion of Pan American Airways flight 103 en route from London to New York that crashed in Lockerbie Scotland, killing 259 passengers and crew and 11 people on the ground. Also, France suspected that Libyans were involved in the bombing and crash of UTA flight 772 over Niger in Africa in 1989.

The United States has noted al-Qadhafi recent recantations on his support for terrorism with some skepticism and caution.

Mr. Speaker, if indeed Mr. al-Qadhafi and his regime have indeed reformed, the civilized world would feel a lot better if they had more time to establish a favorable track record in this regard. To reward such recent behavior with this very important and prestigious appointment makes a mockery of what this commission stands for.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of H. Con. Res. 27, which condemns the selection of Libya to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

The international community has long known that Libya has a deplorable record on human rights and is a sponsor of terrorism. For that reason, it is shocking that Libya is now the chair of a body charged with the responsibility of promoting universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for the world's citizens.

The United Nations' decision to elect Libya as the Chair of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights is alarming for several reasons. First, it is remarkable that United Nations would even consider Libya's candidacy for the position, given the fact that Libya has not accepted responsibility for its role in the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 that killed hundreds of innocent people over Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988. Until Libya takes responsibility for its actions and complies with particular Security Council mandates, Libya cannot have any credibility in being the chair of a United Nations commission that promotes human rights. In today's world, where we seek to defeat the threat posed by international terrorism, it is irresponsible for a state like Libya to be elected to such a leadership position.

Second, Libya's selection to be chair of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights reflects a disturbing trend in international institutions. It has become highly prevalent that states which violate human rights laws seek to secure positions in global bodies that espouse such laws so they can protect their reputations and those of similar regimes. Members of the international community must speak out against such practices lest these institutions become a mockery of international law and human rights.

I urge the House to pass this resolution, which states in the strongest possible terms the outrage of Congress at the selection of Libya to chair the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The Resolution clearly states that: (1) Libya is a gross violator of

human rights; (2) it is a state sponsor of terrorism; (3) several countries as well as international organizations have condemned Libya's selection as chair of the Commission; (4) the United States is appalled by the European Union's common position of abstention on the critical vote over Libya's selection as chair of the commission; (5) the Secretary of State should engage member countries to support the United States efforts to ensure that states that are gross violators of human rights or sponsors of terrorism not ascend to leadership positions in the United Nations.

Libya has a horrific human rights record. Citizens do not choose their leaders in free and fair elections, nor are they able to petition their government for redress of grievances. It uses summary judicial proceedings to suppress domestic opposition. Security forces torture prisoners during interrogations and as punishment. Security forces arbitrarily arrest and detain persons, and many prisoners are held incommunicado. Many political detainees are held for years without charge. There is not an independent judiciary that enforces legal rights of citizens, and citizens do not have the right to a fair public trial or to be represented by legal counsel. The government infringes on citizens' privacy rights, and citizens do not have the right to be secure in their homes or persons, or to own private property. Libya restricts freedom of speech, press, assembly, association, and religion. Is this the type of country that should be charged with being the chair of a commission that promotes human rights? I think not.

Libya is one of seven countries on the State Department's list of state sponsors of terror. As I have said in the past, Libya has continued to acquire weapons of mass destruction and promote state-sponsored terrorism. Last year, our Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security said that there was no doubt that Libya seeks nuclear weapons. Furthermore, he said that Libya has produced at least 100 tons of different kinds of chemical weapons. It is antithetical to the United Nations' mission for peace that a state engaged in creating global havoc be in charge of one of its most important committees.

It is imperative that members of the international community do not retreat from their responsibility to ensure that those charged with monitoring human rights are not, in fact, grave violators themselves. We must not give credibility to countries which violate human rights and support terrorism. To do otherwise is to legitimize their practices.

Congress has recently made its policy clear with respect to Libya's alarming behavior. In 2001, Congress passed the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act of 2001, which President Bush signed into law in August 2001. I was an original co-sponsor of the bill, and in the Ways and Means Committee I argued in favor of extending the current sanctions in place against Iran and Libya for an additional five years. ILSA threatens the imposition of economic sanctions against foreign entities investing in Iran and Libya's energy sectors. ILSA combines deterrence (the possibility of sanctions) with presidential discretion (through broad waiver authority). ILSA has been very effective so far, the Congress overwhelmingly approved the reauthorization of legislation to keep the pressure on Libya and Iran to stop their pursuit of weapons of mass destruction and ballistics missile technology. Libya also remains hostile

to the State of Israel and may support terrorist activities against Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it is this great nation's hope that it can one day live in a world where it is not threatened by international terrorism and that human rights for all will be respected. The selection of Libya as chair to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights undermines these goals. I, therefore, urge the House to pass this resolution by a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Chairman for bringing this important issue to the attention of the House and the American people.

Two years ago, many in this chamber were shocked when the United States was removed from the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and of the International Narcotics Control Board.

The U.S. was a founding member of the Human Rights Commission and First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt was its first Chair.

The U.S. spends more money fighting the use of illegal narcotics than any other nation in the world.

Despite these facts, some of our "friends"—and I use the term with increasing skepticism—at the United Nations felt it was more important that nations like Libya and Syria serve on the U.N. agency overseeing human rights and that the Netherlands—a country whose own Web page admits they will not enforce their drug laws—should serve in our place on a board designed to enforce drug laws.

Chairman HYDE stood up and led this body to call for the suspension of U.S. funds to the U.N. until we were reinstated on the Human Rights Commission. We are now back on that board.

I offered an amendment that passed this House to curtail our funding of the International Narcotics Control Board until we were returned to its membership. This year the U.S. was again shut out while Iran, Brazil and Nigeria were added to the Board.

We have seen that the United Nations does not learn from its mistakes. As former President Reagan might have said, "There they go again."

While we have been reelected to the Human Rights Commission, Libya has been elected to its Chairmanship. Think about that. Libya. A nation led by a brutal dictator who is known to sponsor international terrorism. Yet only two other nations joined the U.S. in opposing their election to head this prestigious body whose duty is to protect human rights. Eight European nations made the "courageous" decision to abstain.

And in an example of how momentum is the true ruler of the United Nations and its bloated bureaucracy, this year's meeting of the U.N. Conference on Disarmament will be presided over by Iraq—despite the fact that Iraq is under U.N. sanctions for failing to disarm and even now faces international action for this failure.

I wish I could tell you I was surprised.

But the United Nations has not been the effective body it could have been over the past two decades. Time and time again, the U.N. in recent years has done more harm than good.

I still believe the U.N. can be a useful body. One that helps promote dialogue and the exchange of ideas around the world. But many of its members have forgotten that respect is

earned through logical decisions that advance the security of the world—not by blindly following bureaucratic momentum that promotes rogue regimes at the expense of the greatest democracies in the world.

I truly hope that the actions we take here today send a message to the U.N. and its members that if they want the body to continue to be a force for good and progress in the world, they must think before they act and make decisions worthy of respect. The election of Libya to Chair the Human Rights Commission, and the continued exclusion of the U.S. from U.N. committees and boards, are not decisions of which they should be proud.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 27.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING CZECH REPUBLIC PRESIDENT VACLAV HAVEL

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) honoring Czech Republic President Vaclav Havel.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 22

Whereas Vaclav Havel, President of the Czech Republic, is widely respected throughout the world as a proponent of democratic principles;

Whereas Vaclav Havel's superb skills as a playwright and essayist helped promote democracy in Eastern Europe during the Cold War;

Whereas the plays of Vaclav Havel were instrumental in bringing international attention to the struggle for democracy in Czechoslovakia;

Whereas Vaclav Havel was imprisoned three times for his efforts to promote democratic thought and reforms in communist Czechoslovakia, yet maintained his convictions throughout;

Whereas Vaclav Havel was a cofounder of the human rights organization Charter 77 and the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted;

Whereas Vaclav Havel, as leader of the Civic Forum movement, was a key figure in the 1989 bloodless overthrow of the Czechoslovakian communist government known as the Velvet Revolution;

Whereas following the Velvet Revolution, Vaclav Havel was elected by the people as President of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic in 1990, and following a peaceful split forming two separate states, elected President of the Czech Republic in 1993;

Whereas under the leadership of Vaclav Havel, the Czech Republic has been an important and valued member of the world community;

Whereas under the leadership of Vaclav Havel, the Czech Republic became a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on March 12, 1999;

Whereas during Vaclav Havel's time in office, the economy of the Czech Republic has become one of the most developed in Eastern Europe;

Whereas today, the Czech Republic is a valuable ally of the United States in the war against terrorism;

Whereas Vaclav Havel has been praised as one of the world's great democratic leaders and has been awarded many international prizes recognizing his commitment to peace and democratic principles; and

Whereas Vaclav Havel will step down as President of the Czech Republic on February 2, 2003; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors the life-long commitment of Czech Republic President Vaclav Havel to human rights and democracy;

(2) recognizes the exceptional achievements of Vaclav Havel as playwright and president; and

(3) congratulates Vaclav Havel for his outstanding service to the people of the Czech Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 22, the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This Member rises today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 22, a resolution honoring Czech Republic President Vaclav Havel. The resolution was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), and this Member is pleased to be an original cosponsor. This resolution seeks to recognize, congratulate, and honor President Havel for a combination of 13 years of extraordinary service, first as President of Czechoslovakia and second, since 1993, as President of the Czech Republic. The Constitution of the Czech Republic allows a president to serve only two consecutive 5-year terms, and the United States House of Representatives would like, therefore, to honor President Havel upon the occasion of the end of his term of service on February 2 of this year.

Nearly 13 years ago, on February 21, 1990, President Vaclav Havel addressed a joint session of the United States Congress in this very room. This occasion was less than 4 months after his last arrest by what he characterized as "the most conservative Communist government in Europe," and less than 2 months after Vaclav Havel had been

elected President of Czechoslovakia, in December 1989, by a parliament still dominated by members of the Communist party.

During his inspirational speech to the joint session of Congress, President Havel said many things that made many Members of Congress realize they were not listening to just another political leader of a foreign country. President Havel, in his speech, was discussing what his country, and all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe that had suffered throughout the Cold War, could learn from the United States. He also suggested that perhaps his country could offer something to the United States. In his speech, he stated "We too can offer something to you: our experience and the knowledge that has come from it. This is a subject for books, many of which have already been written and many of which have yet to be written. I shall therefore limit myself to a single idea. The experience I'm talking about has given me one great certainty: Consciousness precedes being, and not the other way around, as Marxists claim."

In explaining that axiom, Havel went on in his speech to explain that: "The only genuine backbone of all of our actions, if they are to be moral, is responsibility. Responsibility is something higher than our family, my country, my company, my success. Responsibility to the order of being where all of our actions are indelibly recorded and only where they will be properly judged. The interpreter or mediator between us and this higher authority is what is traditionally referred to as human conscience. If I subordinate my political behavior to this imperative mediated to me by my conscience, I can't go far wrong."

He went on to say that it is this responsibility dictated by his conscience which caused him to ultimately decide, after resisting for a long time, to accept the burden of political responsibility. In other words, he saw it as a responsibility to accept the presidency of Czechoslovakia. In a related noteworthy admonition to intellectuals in every country he reminded that "If the hope of the world lies in human consciousness, then it is obvious that intellectuals can't go on forever avoiding their share of the responsibility for the world and hiding their distaste for politics under an alleged need for independence."

As a playwright and essayist, Vaclav Havel was a leading figure of the dissident movement against the totalitarian system of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. He was a founder of Charter 77, the underground movement seeking freedom of expression and association, and the basic protection of civic and human rights. He wrote the essay, "The Power of the Powerless," in which he called upon ordinary citizens to live in truth against a totalitarian regime. For his various civic reform efforts, he received multiple prison sentences and served a

total of almost 5 years imprisoned by the Communist regime.

During the events of November-December 1989, which have come to be known as the Velvet Revolution, Vaclav Havel helped form the Civic Forum, a broad coalition of dissident groups, which was the first legal opposition movement in Communist Czechoslovakia. By the end of that year, through a "bloodless revolution," 41 years of Communist dictatorship peacefully came to an end when Vaclav Havel was elected President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I count it a great personal privilege and honor to represent perhaps more Czech-Americans than any Member of Congress. Most of them came to the rolling prairies of Nebraska and the prairie States in the 1870s and 1880s to own their own land and to farm the soil. Other Czechs and Slovaks came to the larger cities of the Midwest, places like Omaha, during the first two decades of the 20th century.

While their Americanization had occurred several generations ago, these Czech-Americans continued to follow closely, and I would say with great anguish, the totalitarian conditions of people in their old homelands of the past. It was, therefore, a particular pleasure for me to watch these Czech-Americans gather in the public meeting places, the restaurants, the bars, and in their homes to watch with amazement and great pride on television the rapid and peaceful Velvet Revolution, which finally ended the Communist stranglehold, to reclaim the democracy that Czechoslovakia had enjoyed only for the brief period between two World Wars.

Vaclav Havel epitomized this return to Czech democracy for both his countrymen and the Americans who watched and marveled at the success of the Velvet Revolution and Havel's leadership, which demonstrated the very best in intellectual and humane leadership.

Since then, President Havel has been an extraordinary politician, leading his country and the countries of Eastern Europe into a future of freedom, democracy, and security. He was probably the foremost proponent in Europe of allowing the former countries of the Warsaw Pact to join NATO. On March 12, 1999, his vision was made a reality when the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary became members of the Alliance. And just last November, his country was honored by hosting the first NATO Summit held behind the former Iron Curtain in Prague, where seven additional countries of Eastern Europe were invited to join the Alliance.

Because parliamentarians from the 19 NATO countries have honored me with the leadership in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I was privileged to be present at the NATO Prague Summit in November of last year. I think it was noteworthy that President Havel, in his host capacity as the dean of all the

NATO heads of state and heads of government in length of service, was accorded an auspicious degree of affection and respect by his peers and other leaders of the Free World. That acclaim reflected not just his leadership for the Czech Republic but also recognized the moral leadership he has provided for all of the countries of Eastern and Central Europe that emerged from communism and, indeed, for the NATO Alliance as a whole.

On January 30 of this year, just 2 days before he was to step down after 13 years as President, he was one of eight European heads of state or government from NATO countries to sign a letter expressing continued solidarity and support with and to the United States in the international fight against terrorism and for possible action against Iraq. The importance of that letter really cannot be overestimated, since it stood in mark contrast to the dissenting positions of four countries, France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg.

Two sentences sum up the essence of that letter and what is most essential in the transatlantic relationship. The statement said: "The real bond between the U.S. and Europe is the values we share: democracy, individual freedom, human rights, and the rule of law. Today, more than ever, the transatlantic bond is a guarantee of our freedom."

□ 1500

Vaclav Havel has been called an artist, an intellectual, the poet of democracy, and an international icon of integrity, wisdom and moral seriousness, and even "the most extraordinary statesman who emerged from the struggle to overthrow communism in Eastern Europe." President Havel likes to say that in November 1989 when he was first told that he had been nominated as a candidate for the office of President of Czechoslovakia, he thought it was a joke. He thought who was he to be President of this new democracy.

This Member is here today to thank President Havel for saying yes and accepting the office of President, including the challenge of politics and public service. By simply choosing to continue to fight for the ideals he fought for during the Cold War, democracy, freedom, human rights and the rule of law, by working tirelessly to include the new central and eastern European democracies into Europe and the alliance, and through his efforts directed toward reconciliation with the old enemies, he has elevated politics and public service, for his country, for Europe, for the trans-Atlantic alliance, and for the world.

Mr. Speaker, this Member will quote from President Havel's first New Year's address to his nation, the newly free Czechoslovakia, on January 1, 1990. President Havel spoke to his fellow citizens about the legacy of over 40 years of the Communist totalitarian

system. He said, "It would be quite unreasonable to understand the sad legacy of the last 40 years as something alien, something bequeathed to us by some distant relative. On the contrary, we must accept this legacy as a sin we committed against ourselves. If we accept it as such, we will understand that it is up to us all, and up to us alone, to do something about it. We cannot blame the previous rulers for everything, not only because it would be untrue but also because it could blunt the duty each of us faces today, that is, the obligation to act independently, freely, reasonably, and quickly. Let us make no mistake: the best government in the world, the best parliament and the best president in the world cannot achieve much on their own. And it would also be wrong to expect a general remedy to come from them alone. Freedom and democracy require participation and therefore responsible action from us all."

Mr. Speaker, this Member joins his colleagues in paying tribute to Vaclav Havel for the vital, moral leadership and idealism he has brought to his service for the Czech Republic and to the community of Western democracies. For his countrymen and all of us in democratic nations, this leadership and focus on participatory democracy is in the best traditions of those heroes of the American democracy that we honor in this great capital city, Jefferson, Madison and others among our Founding Fathers. I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his powerful, eloquent, and thoughtful statement. I also would like to express my deep appreciation to the original sponsor and drafter of this most important resolution, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who has shown his customary leadership by presenting this to us.

Mr. Speaker, last week my good friend, Vaclav Havel, stepped down as President of the Czech Republic. Normally, Mr. Speaker, the return to private life of a democratically elected leader in Europe would not warrant a resolution from the Congress of the United States. But Vaclav Havel was no ordinary President, nor did he serve in ordinary times. Vaclav Havel, an outstanding artist, playwright, and the conscience of the Czech people during decades of Soviet domination, was a key player in the Velvet Revolution under which the Czech people peacefully replaced their communist dictators with an elected and inspiring leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it was a true privilege to have been in Prague to witness one small part of this Velvet Revolution. Thirteen years ago, I had just arrived in Prague on an official mission with

my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), his wife and my wife. Vaclav Havel and his allies had launched large public protests demanding democracy and an end to communist rule. As the gentleman from Missouri and I headed to a meeting, we encountered thousands of Prague residents in Wenceslas Square demonstrating in support of democracy and freedom. We jumped from the car and joined the Czech crowds waving signs and shouting "Havel Na Hrad," Havel to the castle.

The people of Prague were making a simple request, that Vaclav Havel be elected President so he could occupy the home of power and authority in Prague, the beautiful castle which stands on a hill overlooking the city.

These massive demonstrations were a small part of a long process that brought about the Velvet Revolution. Several weeks later, I had the honor of leading congressional colleagues to a meeting with Vaclav Havel when he was already safely ensconced in the castle.

President Havel did not let the Czech people down as their elected leader. He led the Czech nation through a difficult period of political and economic reform. As a result of his extraordinary leadership, Vaclav Havel presided over 13 years of growing Czech prestige and influence in international affairs. He devoted enormous thought and energy to bringing the Czech Republic into the community of Western democracies. Under his leadership, the Czech Republic joined NATO; and next year it is poised to join the European Union.

President Havel has been an unwavering ally of the United States in the war on terrorism, and more recently in our struggle to disarm the regime of Saddam Hussein. This should come as no surprise. Vaclav Havel is a person of great moral authority and enormous personal courage. He devoted his political and artistic life to resisting the totalitarian state. He cofounded the human rights organization Charter 77 and the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted. He was persecuted by communist authorities and repeatedly arrested. Once he was given the opportunity to emigrate, but he bravely chose imprisonment instead.

As President, Havel continued to resist authoritarian dictators by supporting dissidents in Cuba, and just last November by denying the Belarusian dictator, Lukashenko, a visa to the NATO Summit in Prague. I have no doubt that my friend, President Havel, will continue to work to ensure that the merging independent nations of Central and Eastern Europe join the community of democratic nations.

Mr. Speaker, it was a fitting end to President Havel's presidency that he and the Czech Republic were host to the historic NATO summit last November. The leaders of the world used the summit to pay tribute to the wisdom and leadership of Vaclav Havel and to

his remarkable achievements as President. I was honored to be part of the U.S. delegation to the Prague summit; and as I celebrated with Vaclav Havel the success of NATO in the castle overlooking Prague, I was once again struck by Vaclav Havel's long and bold journey from a prisoner of conscience to becoming the conscience of Europe.

I want to ask all of my colleagues to support this resolution commending a true friend of the United States, a leading intellectual figure in Europe, and a moral force sorely needed in Europe by supporting and voting for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), the author of this legislation.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I commend the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and thank him for his leadership on a whole host of foreign policy issues. I also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the committee, and especially the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for the gentleman's help in offering this resolution, doing a Dear Colleague letter, and trying to inform the other Members of Congress of Mr. Havel's retirement.

Mr. Speaker, a silly person once said that only silly people have heroes today. If that is true, this silly person is not afraid to admit that Vaclav Havel is one of my heroes.

Today we honor Vaclav Havel who provided the moral force behind the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia in 1989, and who stepped down as President of the Czech Republic just 1 week ago. If proof is needed that the pen is mightier than the sword, then Vaclav Havel is a veritable smoking gun.

It is a magnificent irony that one of the most oppressive communist regimes in Eastern Europe would one day be led by a poet and playwright. But there is a tradition in this part of the world that intellectual integrity and independent art translate into raw political power. Mr. Havel provided the leadership through raw moral force that gave rise to the incredible and peaceful revolutionary movement which we now refer to as the Velvet Revolution.

As uncompromising in his resistance to the totalitarian state as he is in his ironic plays, President Havel withstood censure, numerous imprisonments, and the muzzle to become the premier symbol of Czechoslovakian dissidence in the years after the Soviet Union crushed Prague back in 1968.

He helped found the Charter 77 dissident movement, the moral blueprint for the revolution, and then formed the Civic Forum, the main opposition party in Czechoslovakia against the

communist regime. Through his clashes with the authority, he was repeatedly sent to prison. His essays setting out his ideas on national resurgence in a totalitarian state, "The Power of the Powerless," was widely studied inside and outside of Czechoslovakia.

In it, he argued that citizens living "in truth" could successfully confront and overturn dictatorial rulers. For his views, the regime forced him in 1979 to choose between exile or 5 years in prison. He chose prison and his enduring stature is partly a result of that choice. He later collected the letters he wrote from prison to his wife in a widely read volume, "Letters to Olga."

Mr. Speaker, as a recent graduate of law school back in 1990, I was in one of my short disillusioned states in regards to our own democracy at the time, but was watching with rapt attention the incredible frenzy of events in Eastern Europe leading to the collapse of the communist regimes and ultimately the collapse of the Berlin Wall. I had the opportunity to travel throughout Eastern Europe shortly after these revolutions took place. I spent a little time in Czechoslovakia where I was part of an international student group restoring some of the old castles in Czechoslovakia.

□ 1515

It was during that time, Mr. Speaker, when I also met other political heroes of mine. These were students approximately my age who were, just a few months previously, literally on the front lines of these demonstrations, literally staring down the guns of the Communist forces, knowing their history, but also not knowing whether this would be a repeat of the Prague Spring in 1968, which resulted in a bloody massacre.

I met and stayed with many of these students and I asked them what they were thinking during that time, those fateful couple of weeks in November of 1989. They responded that two things stood out in their minds: one, how bitterly cold it was during those nights during the candlelight vigils, standing out in Wenceslas Square, snow coming down and they were all shivering; and, secondly, how terribly frightened they were.

History now shows that by a vote of 5 to 4, the Communist Politburo decided not to order the troops to open fire on these demonstrators.

It was a lot of these same students who would during the day go out into the countryside and into the homes and villages and town squares throughout Czechoslovakia, bringing news of the demonstrations and the movement building against the Communist regime. They understood that it required the support of the working families, the workers of Czechoslovakia, before the regime could ultimately be brought down.

In the midst of all of this was their guiding force, Vaclav Havel, whom they held in high esteem, and still do

today based on the correspondence that I have with them. It was an inspiring time for me to meet these young people and to understand that they realized that there were causes greater than themselves worth fighting for and perhaps worth dying for. It was literally their future that was on the line. Through the strength of their collective action, they achieved remarkable change throughout Eastern Europe.

In 1989 and after, President Havel's genius was not just to harness popular resistance that peacefully overwhelmed the Communist regime; it was to understand that to take the trappings of leadership did not mean to betray his own humanity. He was not, however, immune to political defeat. He resigned temporarily rather than preside during the bitter separation of Czechoslovakia back in 1993. But internationally he shone. He led his country into NATO in 1999 and he has positioned them now to join the European Union next year, in 2004.

When Havel left the presidency after 13 years, he left behind a legacy of individual moral authority. It is hard to find a defined political legacy. Instead, he leaves a sense that in the life of any nation, the character of its leaders do matter.

They are still wrestling to find his replacement today in the Czech Republic. A great debate rages, even bickering is taking place, and, of course, the media and the press are more than eager to report on all of this in the Czech Republic.

For those freedoms, for his service and his sacrifice and for his shining moral example, it is only right that the United States Congress pause in our normal duties of the day to give thanks and to pay tribute to one of the greatest leaders of the 20th century, Vaclav Havel.

I am sure all of my colleagues wish him much happiness throughout his retirement.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from Wisconsin for a truly moving and powerful statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to join in commending the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) for his articulate statement and his initiative. This matter would have been taken up last week if it had not been for the schedule change because of the Columbia disaster.

I urge strong support by all the Members for this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Vaclav Havel is sometimes called the "conscience of the Czech Republic." In fact, he could be called the conscience of the world. As both playwright and president, he has set an example for his country men and women and inspired others around the globe.

As a Member serving on the Helsinki Commission, I first became aware of Vaclav Havel and his stance as a leader of the Charter '77

human rights movement. At a time when most Czechoslovaks preferred to keep their heads low, he held his up. When others dared not speak out, he raised his voice. While others hid from communism in their apartments and weekend cottages, he faced it down in prison. In recognition of his extraordinary leadership and courage, the Commission leadership recommended him for the Nobel Peace Prize in February 1989.

Vaclav Havel once wrote of the "power of the powerless" and, on November 17, 1989, when the Velvet Revolution began, the world saw that power manifested in reality.

Mr. Speaker, Vaclav Havel is a man who has always been guided by the courage of his convictions. Remarkably, his courage did not fade upon his assumption of the presidency. Indeed, he is all the more heroic for his remaining steadfast to his commitment to human rights even from the comforts of the Prague Castle.

From the beginning of his tenure, as he addressed his country's communist and totalitarian past, he was a voice of reason, not revenge. In 1993, he rightly identified the situation of Roma as "a litmus test for civil society." Throughout his presidency, he has pardoned those facing criminal charges under communist-era laws that restrict free speech and have yet to be repealed. In 2001, he spoke out against the parliament's regressive religion law, which turned the clock back on religious freedom. He has raised human rights issues from Cuba to China. And, he has reminded other world leaders of our shared responsibility for the poor and less fortunate.

H. Con. Res. 22 pays tribute to Vaclav Havel's singular compassion, integrity, and vision. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a man who has given so much to his country and the world.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 22.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMENDING ISRAEL ON THEIR ELECTIONS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 61) commending the people of Israel for conducting free and fair elections, reaffirming the friendship between the Governments and peoples of the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 61

Whereas the United States and Israel are close allies whose people share a deep and

abiding friendship based on a shared commitment to democratic values;

Whereas since its establishment in 1948, Israel has fulfilled the dreams of its founders who envisioned a vigorous, open, and stable democracy;

Whereas an essential feature of Israeli democracy is its system of competitive, free, and open elections;

Whereas on January 28, 2003, the people of Israel elected Israel's 16th Knesset, or Parliament, which in turn will choose the Prime Minister of Israel; and

Whereas the election on January 28, 2003, is the most recent example of the commitment of Israel to the democratic ideals of freedom and pluralism, ideals that Israel shares with the United States

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the people of Israel for reaffirming their dedication to democratic ideals as expressed in the election on January 28, 2003;

(2) expresses both its respect for the freely expressed will of the people of Israel, and its intention to engage in constructive relations with the new Government of Israel, and urges the international community to do so as well;

(3) reaffirms the close bonds of friendship that have bound the people of the United States and the people of Israel together through turbulent times for more than half a century;

(4) urges the Palestinian leadership to abide by its commitments made to the United States and to Israel and urges the Palestinian people to act on President Bush's call of June 24, 2002, to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure, end incitement to violence in official media, elect new leaders not compromised by terror, and embrace democracy; and

(5) restates the commitment of the United States to a secure peace for Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), for introducing this important resolution commending the people of Israel for conducting free and fair elections and reaffirming the close friendship between our two nations.

Virtually since its creation in 1948, the state of Israel has been the only democratic ally of the United States in the region. Today, it is the only country in the Middle East with truly free elections, a vibrant free press, an active civil society and other elements which constitute a free society, mak-

ing it indeed the only country in the Middle East classified as free by Freedom House in its report on democracy and human rights in the region.

Its declaration of independence, its system based on separation of powers, particularly its emphasis on an independent judiciary, its guarantee of equal access for women and minorities, and its guarantee of freedom of religion to the entire population are but some of the parallels that we share, which further strengthen the bonds between our countries. However, our nations share more than just democratic principles.

Regrettably, we have both been victimized by terrorism, the common enemy of the civilized world. The continuing terrorist attacks against Israel clearly follow the pattern of attacking democratic countries which support and implement the rule of law, mistaking the openness and tolerance of such societies as a sign of weakness. Israel is targeted in part because it is our friend and in part because it is an oasis of liberal, democratic values in a vast expanse of authoritarian regimes, fanaticism and bigotry.

As a liberal democracy under repeated attack by murderers who target innocent men, women and children, Israel deserves our steadfast support. This support is essential to Israel's continued survival as a free and democratic nation, for only the United States has the power and political will to provide meaningful assistance to the only parliamentary democracy in the region.

While we may have shared interests with Arab states in the Middle East, it is with Israel that we share core values. As it was in Afghanistan, U.S. foreign policy should be about more than geostrategic concerns. It should also reflect who we are as a nation and as a people.

There is an expression in Spanish which says, loosely translated, "Tell me who your friends are and I'll tell you who you are." Let then the U.S. be judged by its friendship and by its partnership with Israel, the region's truly free, democratic society.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Virginia's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First I would like to pay tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), for introducing this legislation. I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, friendship with Israel and support for its security are unshakable elements of U.S. foreign policy. The primary reason for these close relationships is not just our strategic interests, but our shared values. Democracy and freedom form the core values of both the United States and of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the occasion of Israelis going to the polls as

they did just recently is the appropriate time to mark and to reaffirm this very special relationship. Israel is one of the world's most vibrant democracies.

Some may wonder why we choose to honor this small country for holding an election. After all, Israel has held 17 elections in its 55-year history, five in the past decade alone. Yet another Israeli trip to the polls seems hardly remarkable. But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what earns Israeli democracy its special place in our friendship and respect and its special status among the world's democracies. We take its democratic nature for granted. Yet Israeli democracy endures under extraordinary circumstances, of difficulties, tragedies, and suicide bombings found nowhere else on the face of this planet.

The object of hatred from most of the regimes in its region, not one of which is a democracy, Israel would have every excuse in the world to lapse into the lamentable political mores of its region. But it refuses to do so. Instead, it brings democratic light to a region dominated by dictators.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the people of Israel who have again shown their unswerving devotion to democracy with little sense that they are doing something extraordinary.

Let me also take this opportunity to congratulate Prime Minister Sharon on his impressive plurality and wish him good luck in forming a new government. In passing this resolution, we assure the new Israeli Government that it can look forward to the closest possible relationship with the American people and with the Congress of the United States.

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the author of this resolution, who is our new chief deputy whip and a person with whom I had the pleasure of going to Israel with last year.

I look forward to my next visit to Israel just this Friday. I wish that he would be going with us.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 61, and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentleman from California for their work in bringing this resolution to the floor.

On January 28, citizens in Israel exercised their right to vote in a free, transparent and democratic election. In Israel, like the United States, the right of citizens to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race, color, creed, sex or religion. Unfortunately, commitment to democracy and equal rights is a rarity in the Middle East. Israel's neighbors, like Syria, Iran, Iraq and others, do not share our respect for freedom. Behaviors that we consider basic rights, like free speech, fair trials, freedom of the press and

freedom of religion are nonexistent. The concepts of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are often demonized in some countries as sinful products of the Great Satan culture of the West.

That is, Mr. Speaker, why I stand here today and congratulate our only democratic ally in the Middle East, Israel, a country that stands with the United States on the key principles of human rights, freedom, peace and democracy, a country like no other in its region.

Mr. Speaker, like the United States, Israel is currently fighting a war on terrorism against people dedicated to hate and destruction, people dedicated to ending freedom and democracy, and dedicated to suppressing the basic rights of life and liberty.

□ 1530

It is incomprehensible, but these armies of evil believe that they can destroy, maim, and kill innocent people in the name of God. For the past 22½ years, Israel has faced an unrelenting campaign of violence and terror against her citizens, a war that began just months after the region stood at the doorstep of peace waiting to enter and then the door was abruptly shut. Throughout all of this unrest, it is amazing that on January 28 just a few weeks ago, the Israeli people engaged in the most basic and important feature of democracy. They held free, open, and competitive elections, an act in stark contrast to their dictatorial enemies.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States consider Israel a real friend, a true ally. We must maintain our commitment to Israel's security. We must stand steadfast with President Bush and hold the Palestinian Authority to the strict guidelines laid out during the President's June 24 Rose Garden speech. We know from past experience that imposing an artificial deadline will not result in peace in the Middle East. Peace will only come with security, not in spite of it. Israel has always made a sincere commitment to peace in the region. Many times her commitment to peace has come at the expense of innocent life. We need to make sure we stand with and support our only democratic ally in the region.

I join my colleagues today in congratulating Israel on free and democratic elections, and I welcome a continued dialogue on how to best stop the violence and bring about peace and stability in this vitally important region.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL), one of our new colleagues who has already demonstrated qualities of great leadership in this body.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in commending the Nation of Israel and to support passage of this very important resolution. A great philosopher once wrote that "freedom cannot be

bought for nothing. If you hold her precious, you must hold all else of little worth."

Those words were written thousands of years ago, but I cannot think of any contemporary statement that provides such a clear window into the times in which we now live, into the struggle in which we are now locked.

As we have once again learned here in America this past year, the struggle for freedom is a constant one. It is a battle never completely won but one that must be perpetually fought. The battle for freedom is one that exacts an enormous price, and few people on this Earth have paid as heavy a price for their freedom as the people of Israel.

And as we see on our evening news on too many nights, the sons and daughters of Israel continue to pay that price just as they have for thousands of years. I think it is only fitting that in the wake of their 17th consecutive election as a free nation that the United States Congress would honor the Nation of Israel. We should honor them for their unwaivering commitment to find and hold freedom, and we should honor them for the sacrifice millions of Jewish people have made in pursuit of their dream, in pursuit of their right to hold free elections as a free people.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Texas for his eloquent and powerful statement, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grave concerns with the content of the resolution congratulating Israel on their recent elections.

What could—and should—have been a nice innocuous resolution congratulating a key ally for running their recent election more fairly than we can, was instead hijacked by anti-Palestinian groups in Congress and turned into another diatribe against the Palestinians.

Rather than simply congratulating Israel, the resolution includes language accusing Palestinian leaders of supporting terrorism in Israel and the occupied territories. It further suggest that leaders of the Palestinian Authority, chosen by the Palestinian people, should be thrown out of office. If our role as a nation is to play peace broker in the Middle East, we must stop choosing sides in this ongoing conflict in which neither side is fully in the right.

I do commend Israel for conducting a free and fair election and I wish I could say the same for our most recent Presidential election. But, the commendation should have ended there.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly must oppose this resolution.

Though I am sure this resolution commending Israel for holding free elections was introduced with the best intentions, this legislation unfortunately goes further than a simple commendation. The legislation as written will only once again inject the United States into the decades-old and intractable conflict in the Middle East. By commending Israel while at the same time demanding that the Palestinians take specific actions, this legislation places the United States squarely in the middle of a conflict that has absolutely nothing to do with American interests. Also, the resolution states that the United States is committed

to secure peace for Israel. We cannot afford nor are we constitutionally permitted to play referee in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and securing peace for any country but the United States is not the role of this body.

We must resist the temptation to meddle in the affairs of far-away nations no matter how good our intentions may be. If we are to keep our Constitutional republic we must uphold the wise counsel of those who crafted our founding set of laws.

Thomas Jefferson summed up the foreign policy position we must uphold in his 1801 inaugural address: "People, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none." How many champion Jefferson and the Constitution, but conveniently ignore both when it comes to American foreign policy? Washington similarly urged that the U.S. must "Act for ourselves and not for others," by forming an "American character wholly free of foreign attachments." Do so many on Capitol Hill now believe Washington was wrong?

Mr. Speaker, how many more times must we place ourselves and our country at risk by taking one side or other in battles, wars, and conflicts that have nothing to do with the United States, and where anger toward the United States will inevitably result? I urge my colleagues to uphold the Constitution and vote against this unfortunately-worded resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating a resolution congratulating Israel for conducting free and fair elections. I, too, rise to offer my congratulations to the people of Israel for their recent free and open elections.

That being said, I have concerns with the wording of the resolution. I find it curious that a resolution of congratulations to the Israeli people also contains condemnations of the actions—or inactions—of the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution refers to President Bush's statement of June 24, 2002. But what is the vision of this Administration? Secretary Colin Powell said it is to build, "a region where Israelis and Arabs can live together in peace, security, and dignity." The resolution before us mentions peace and security for Israel, but it says nothing of peace and security for the Palestinian people in the Occupied Territories. Where is the balance?

Unfortunately, we again have a resolution before the House that is perceived to be one-sided in nature, and which does not present the United States as an honest broker to both sides in this conflict.

I will support this resolution, but I wish to make it know that the Congress of the United States should strive to support the goal of peace in the region for all peoples. The United States must act as an even-handed honest broker to all parties in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict if there is ever to be peace in the region.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 61.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXTENDING CERTAIN HYDRO-ELECTRIC LICENSES IN THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 337) to extend certain hydro-electric licenses in the State of Alaska.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 337

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STAY AND REINSTATEMENT OF FERC LICENSE NO. 11393.

(a) Upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 11393, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall issue an order staying the license.

(b) Upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 11393, but not later than 6 years after the date that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission receives written notice that construction of the Swan-Tyee transmission line is completed, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall issue an order lifting the stay and make the effective date of the license the date on which the stay is lifted.

(c) Upon request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 11393 and notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act for the commencement of construction, the Commission shall, after reasonable notice and in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section, extend the time period during which licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for not more than one 2-year time period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 337 and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 337, which was introduced by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). The bill before us today directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, known as FERC, upon request of a license to issue a stay of a license for a hydroelectric project in Alaska pending the construction of an

associated transmission line. In addition, the bill also directs FERC to extend the construction deadline for this project for not more than a 2-year time period once the stay is lifted.

This bill is identical to Senate bill S. 1843 as passed by the House during the final days of the 107th Congress and unfortunately was prevented from being signed into law due to a clerical error. Today we rectify that incident and once again let the will of the House be known concerning the license for the construction of a 96-megawatt hydroelectric power project at Mahoney Lake near Ketchikan in southeast Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Power Act authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue licenses for the construction of new hydroelectric power projects. Section 13 of the act establishes time limits for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project once FERC has issued a license. The licensee must begin construction not more than 2 years from the date the license is issued unless FERC extends the initial deadline.

Section 13 permits FERC to grant only one extension of that deadline for not longer than 2 additional years when not incompatible with the public interest. Accordingly, FERC lacks the authority to extend the deadline beyond a maximum of 2 years from the original deadline for commencement of construction. Therefore, a license is subject to termination if a licensee fails to begin construction within 4 years of the date of issuance. There are many reasons why construction of a project may not begin within the statutory 4-year period, including lack of a power sales contract or, in the case of the bill before us, the absence of a completed transmission line to carry power from the project to areas where it is needed.

The purpose of the bill before us, H.R. 337, is to direct FERC upon the request of the licensee to issue an order staying a license of a hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, pending the construction of an associated transmission line. Once the line is completed, the bill directs FERC to lift the stay and extend the deadline to commence construction for one additional 2-year period. The legislation also directs FERC to extend the deadline to commence construction of the project for one additional 2-year period.

On January 22, 1998, FERC issued a license to the City of Saxman, Alaska, to construct and operate and maintain the 96-megawatt Mahoney Lake Hydroelectric Project. The project is located on Upper Mahoney Lake and Upper Mahoney Creek near Ketchikan in

southeast Alaska. The project is not projected to be economically viable until the completion of the associated Swan-Tyee transmission line. The Cape Fox Corporation, which oversees the construction and the operation and the maintenance of the project, stands to lose a substantial investment in the project if the license expires prior to completion of the transmission line.

Last year, S. 1843, a similar bill, was amended and passed the House by unanimous consent. While that bill was amended by the House, the official papers that were delivered to the Senate did not contain the amendment that passed the House. As a result, the version subsequently passed by the Senate did not contain the House amendment, and the Speaker properly did not sign the bill to clear it for the White House since the official papers did not accurately reflect the vote or the will of the House. This was the right thing for the Speaker to do. It is important that the author and supporters of this bill not be penalized unnecessarily for the clerical error that occurred in the House. I am pleased we are able to move this bill quickly to fulfill our commitment to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and to his constituents. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 397.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REINSTATING AND EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT IN ILLINOIS

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 397) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 397

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT.

Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 11214, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that sec-

tion and the Commission's procedures under that section—

(1) reinstate the license for the construction of the project as of the effective date of the surrender of the license; and

(2) extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for 3 consecutive 2-year periods beyond the date that is 4 years after the date of issuance of the license.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 397, a bill that I introduced. H.R. 397, which passed the Committee on Energy and Commerce by voice vote, will help the city of Carlyle, Illinois, construct a hydroelectric power plant on Carlyle Lake in my district. This plant will enable communities in southwestern Illinois to use water flowing through the Carlyle Lake Dam to help meet their energy needs.

In 1967 the Army Corps of Engineers formed Carlyle Lake by building a dam on the Kaskaskia River. Since the lake was formed, surrounding communities have not had a hydroelectric power plant to make use of the lake's tremendous potential as a renewable energy source. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, known as FERC, granted Southwestern Electric Cooperative a license to begin construction of a power plant in 1997. But the cooperative surrendered the license after it was unable to begin the project in the required time period. This legislation would permit the FERC to reinstate Southwestern Electric Cooperative's license and extend the deadline to begin construction so that there is time to properly design a facility.

This generating facility will utilize the already-existing dam, helping to reduce the cost and minimize any environmental concerns. The city of Carlyle estimates that the hydroelectric power plant would provide more than one third its annual energy needs.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise in support of H.R. 397, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) on the Committee of En-

ergy and Commerce. H.R. 397 extends the deadline for commencement of construction for up to 6 years. Not counting the years in which the license was surrendered, this potentially amounts to 9 years for the licensee to commence construction. The legislation provides for up to three consecutive 2-year extensions instead of a single 6-year extension to ensure that the licensee must continue to meet Federal Power Act section 13 requirements to prosecute construction in good faith and with due diligence before obtaining each 2-year extension.

This requirement to move forward in good faith and due diligence is important because when someone holds a license, but fails to develop a project, that someone is potentially preventing others from developing the site for hydropower or other uses. Sometimes a licensee who is not developing a site may in fact be purposely using license extensions to prevent other potential applicants from developing it, a process known as "site banking." While FERC is not aware of any other party that is interested in this particular case in developing this site, if FERC determines a licensee is not prosecuting construction in good faith and with due diligence, the agency can in fact refuse to grant a request for an additional 2-year extension, can terminate the license, and make the site available for other uses. This is appropriate public policy.

The author deserves credit for crafting the legislation in this manner. I urge my colleagues to pass the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 397.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

RECOGNIZING THE 92ND BIRTHDAY OF RONALD REAGAN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 19) recognizing the 92nd birthday of Ronald Reagan.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 19

Whereas February 6, 2003, is the 92d birthday of Ronald Wilson Reagan;

Whereas Ronald Reagan is the first former President ever to attain the age of 92;

Whereas both Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan have distinguished records of public service to the United States, the American people, and the international community;

Whereas Ronald Reagan was twice elected by overwhelming margins as President of the United States;

Whereas Ronald Reagan fulfilled his pledge to help restore "the great, confident roar of American progress, growth, and optimism" and ensure renewed economic prosperity;

Whereas Ronald Reagan's leadership was instrumental in extending freedom and democracy around the globe and uniting a world divided by the Cold War;

Whereas Ronald Reagan is loved and admired by millions of Americans, and by countless others around the world;

Whereas the recent tragic loss of the space shuttle *Columbia* and her crew remind us of how, 17 years ago, Ronald Reagan's eloquence helped heal the Nation after the *Challenger* disaster;

Whereas Nancy Reagan not only served as a gracious First Lady but also led a national crusade against illegal drug use;

Whereas, together Ronald and Nancy Reagan dedicated their lives to promoting national pride and to bettering the quality of life in the United States and throughout the world; and

Whereas the thoughts and prayers of the Congress and the country are with Ronald Reagan in his courageous battle with Alzheimer's disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress, on behalf of the American people, extends its birthday greetings and best wishes to Ronald Reagan on his 92d birthday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 19.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 19, introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), recognizes the 92nd birthday of President Ronald Reagan.

Last Thursday, February 6, Ronald Reagan became the first President to reach the age of 92. This resolution honors the man whose very name represents an era, a leader who saw in America that shining city on a hill when we had lost our sense of national purpose.

Reagan's legacy transcends the decade in which he served. He has become the standard bearer of expectations for modern-day Presidents. And as time passes, history is judging him well. Those who once doubted Reagan's vision have come to recognize his greatness.

During two terms in office, Reagan bounced back from a would-be assass-

sin's attack with humor and courage. In an all-too-familiar scene, he comforted a Nation coping with the loss of our *Challenger 7*, and he kept his promises. Reagan campaigned on tax relief, and he delivered tax relief. In the process, he fueled record growth and expansion.

Reagan's accomplishments were not just on do the domestic front. At the Brandenburg Gate, he defied the diplomats and said what millions of Americans were thinking: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." Today, we know that Communist Russia was shaken to its core by this new type of a leader, one who was not afraid to stand tall for freedom.

Now I hope this House will join all Americans in honoring President Reagan's 92nd birthday and, more importantly, his remarkable life.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Joint Resolution 19.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself of such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a bigger-than-life screen actor and television personality, Ronald Reagan moved from being Governor of California in the 1960s to President of the United States and dominating American politics in the 1980s.

He was the first President to be re-elected to a second term since Dwight Eisenhower. Media-made and media-presented, Ronald Reagan got millions of Americans to feel proud of their Nation. America's 40-year Cold War with the Soviet Union cooled considerably and perhaps actually ended during Reagan's presidency. Many Americans credit him with having achieved what became a significant outcome.

Born the son of a shoe salesman in small-town Illinois, Reagan's impoverished but loving parents instilled in him a sense of optimism that carried him through college as an average student. After graduation, he worked for a few years as a sports broadcaster in Midwestern radio before landing a film contract with Warner Brothers, which took him to Hollywood in 1936. Over the next 30 years, Reagan made scores of films, including many Army films produced during World War II. He hosted two popular television series and he actively engaged in politics as president of the Screen Actors Guild.

In the 1950s, Ronald Reagan changed from being a Roosevelt New Deal Democrat to a conservative Republican. In 1966, he became Governor of California. He was reelected in 1970. Using his popularity in California, Reagan unsuccessfully challenged President Gerald Ford for the Republican nomination in 1976. He tried again and won the nomination in 1980, and thereafter defeated the incumbent Democrat, Jimmy Carter. With his 1984 reelection victory, President Reagan became the most politically successful Republican President since Eisenhower.

Today, we celebrate former President of the United States Ronald Reagan's 92nd birthday. We wish him well, and trust that he will continue to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the distinguished sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to commemorate the birthday of President Reagan. As you know, he turned 92 just a few days ago, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, we were delayed in honoring him here on the floor because of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* tragedy. It is fitting that we remember President Reagan in this context because in his time, during his presidency, he helped heal and bring together our Nation in the wake of the *Challenger* disaster.

Just as his words honored the crew of the Space Shuttle *Challenger*, President Reagan's eloquence continues to comfort and console us as we now remember the fallen crew of the Space Shuttle *Columbia*. President Reagan's words of January 28, 1986, speak to us 17 years later with all of their original force and beauty. He said, "We will never forget them, nor the last time we saw them, as they prepared for their journey and waved good-bye, and 'slipped the surly bonds' of effort and 'to touch the face of God.'"

At 92, President Reagan is America's oldest President ever. The previous record was set by John Adams. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that John Adams and Thomas Jefferson died on the same day, and they died, even more remarkably, on the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

As we think back years from now, as we think back on our founding, on our founders, on the Declaration of Independence and our great Presidents, I am quite sure that we will recall Ronald Reagan, for he has already distinguished himself as one of America's most remarkable individuals.

Any one of his careers would itself be worthy of recognition by this Congress. He was an accomplished sports announcer on radio. He was a very renowned film actor. As you know, he was one of the best-known actors in America. He was a labor leader, twice elected president of the Screen Actors Guild. He was a very successful two-term Governor of California, and a very successful two-term President of the United States, elected twice in landslides.

He was called the Great Communicator, in part because he spent so much time on television explaining his policies to us. He was quite good at it. But it was more than communication skill, because he had something very important to communicate. Lady Thatcher, then Prime Minister Thatcher, compared Ronald Reagan to Winston Churchill. She said, "Like Winston Churchill, he made words fight like soldiers, and lifted the spirit of a nation."

If the events of September 11 have taught us anything, it is that America still requires a strong national defense against enemies who would destroy freedom and democracy.

When Ronald Reagan became President, we had endured an era of national malaise, bereft of any sense of moral direction. Throughout his term of office, throughout 8 of the fastest-moving years in history, President Reagan brought our Nation back with his Irish twinkle and that homespun style of his, which seemed never to abate. He brought a new assurance to America.

He not only was America's oldest President, he was one of America's most active Presidents ever, and he was one of the most energetic leaders of the Free World that the world has ever seen. With a toughness that we had not seen in a long time, he stood toe-to-toe with what he unabashedly described as the Evil Empire. For such moral clarity, he was dismissed as naive and dangerously undiplomatic.

When he said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," he was criticized. The realists among us knew that the Soviet Union was going to be there forever and we should learn to accommodate it. President Reagan saw a different future, and he worked hard to bring it about. As a result, hundreds of millions of people, not just in the Soviet Union, but throughout Central and Eastern Europe, were liberated.

If he were with us here today, President Reagan would humbly acknowledge that he appreciated the birthday wishes on the 53rd anniversary of his 39th birthday.

When former President Clinton was running for office, he once said America needed a President for the '90s. Perhaps now, if we could repeal the 27th Amendment, we could have a President in his 90s. Hope springs eternal.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan and his vision will not be forgotten. His love of country and his ability to see the best in all of us revitalized our common faith in the American dream. President Reagan's enthusiasm and big-hearted spirit of America continues to inspire us with a vision of our potential and the limitless possibilities that dwell just beyond the horizon.

As he said at the end of his D-Day speech in Normandy, we can say of President Reagan: Mr. President, we will always remember, and we will always be proud. Happy birthday.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for introducing this very worthwhile measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognizing the 92nd birthday of President Ronald Reagan. To many Americans, President Reagan is more than a man. He is an extraor-

dinary symbol of all that makes our society great. And as the foundation of President Reagan's greatness is his character, so it is part and parcel of our Nation's character as well.

He once said, "The character that takes command in moments of crucial choices has already been determined by 1,000 other choices made earlier in seemingly unimportant moments."

At this hour, as Congress wrestles with crucial choice, our character is being tested, I pray vigorously that our response will be founded in a tradition of great character, of wise choices. May we look to the character of Ronald Reagan for inspiration.

I will close with these words from his farewell address: "Because we are a great Nation, our challenges seem complex. It will always be this way. But as long as we remember our first principles and believe in ourselves, the future will always be ours."

Happy birthday, Mr. President.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it can be said that the most important facet and indispensable quality for leadership is to be able to see the future, at least in its most important aspects, and the ability to stay the course, despite all the inevitable pressures leading in other directions in order to reach that future.

I consider it an honor to be able to rise in this House of Representatives today to wish President Reagan happy birthday on the occasion of his 92nd birthday.

□ 1600

The United States of America and, indeed, the world, owes so much to Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan was someone who, at a very critical moment in the history of the United States, arose and offered himself in leadership to, in effect, save the Free World. I admire Ronald Reagan profoundly. Each day, as we have the opportunity to learn more and more about the history of the tumultuous events that saw his presidency, that his presidency lived through, as we learn more, we see Ronald Reagan's greatness more, and not only his importance, but his indispensable, indispensable contribution to the freedom of the world and the end of what he rightfully called the Evil Empire as seen in all its truth.

So I commend my colleagues for having brought this resolution forward. Happy birthday, President Reagan.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a great man, our 40th President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, on the occasion of his 92nd birthday. I believe it is indeed appropriate that I make my first speech

on the House floor in honor of this great man.

If it were not for his principles of limited government, personal responsibility, and strong fiscal discipline, I might not be here today. Mr. Speaker, it is with those principles in mind that I decided to become a candidate for the United States House of Representatives. It is those principles that I will remain loyal to as long as I am a Member of this body.

In 1985 President Reagan said, "We in government should learn to look at our country with the eyes of the entrepreneur, seeing possibilities where others see only problems." As a former small business owner, I could not agree more with that sentiment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are here today, able to honor President Reagan, because it has given me an opportunity to say "thank you" to a great man, and happy birthday, Mr. President.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 92nd birthday of our 40th President, the honorable and great Ronald Reagan.

We live in a world today that is very similar to the world that Ronald Reagan faced as President in 1981 to 1989. Just as the President overcame an economy that at the time was buried in a recession and he fought to rid the world of communism, so too our President today, George W. Bush, is working hard to put in place an economic package that will spur on the economy, while continuing to fight terrorism, both here and abroad as well.

President Reagan entered the White House in 1981 when the economy was in a recession. His solution to that problem was dubbed then, and we still call it today, "Reaganomics." It involved an immediate and across-the-board tax cut; and it was designed to create jobs, encourage investment, and provide economic efficiency in this country.

His policies essentially laid down the foundations for a prosperous and generous society. His tax cuts eventually led to higher government revenues, not less; greater economic efficiency and, ultimately, pulling us out of that recession.

President Reagan also took a strong moral stance against communism on all fronts. Knowing that our Nation faced grave threats on a daily basis, he provided our military with the resources they needed at that time to get the job done, and they were able to get the job done.

President Reagan is really one of the greatest figures of our time, and he will be remembered in the White House and in this Nation as a man of great talent and great character.

We must honor his legacy today by continuing to ensure that tyranny is

conquered by liberty and that every American sees permanent tax relief in their checkbook.

I believe we do this, Mr. Speaker, by continuing to make every effort to stand for freedom, defend our citizens, and to help make the world a safer and better place to live. We do that by bringing terrorists to justice and spreading prosperity to all Americans with job creation and immediate tax relief.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who knew and worked very closely with President Reagan.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, happy birthday to Ronald Reagan. I am sure Nancy is watching, and she knows how much we care for and love Ronald Reagan; and she has been at his side from the beginning.

I met Ronald Reagan when I worked in his campaign for Governor in 1966. I worked on both of his presidential campaigns; and then, after he won his presidential race in 1980, I went with him to the White House for 7 years and worked with him as one of his principal speech writers. Let me note, I had never written a speech for anyone before I wrote a speech for Ronald Reagan as President of the United States. He taught me all about speech-writing. We always used to say, if President Reagan was not a President, he was a good enough writer to be the President's speech writer.

But more than that, his skill was his principles that counted. He had principles and ideals. He had a philosophy that included an economic philosophy and a personal philosophy. He brought about a change in the national spirit that saved America. He brought about a change in the economy that saved America. He brought about a change in America's strategic position that saved the world. His tax cuts turned our economy around and gave us the longest period of growth in American history. And yes, there were deficits. But had we not had Ronald Reagan's economic policy in place, those deficits charted out the way it was before Reagan would have been twice as big as what happened under Reagan's period of growth.

Bill Clinton could not even change the direction that Ronald Reagan started. That is how strong an influence he was on the American people. Remember, right up here, Bill Clinton declared the era of big growth or big government is over.

But what is most important, Ronald Reagan, criticized by people on the other side of the aisle, criticized as a war monger, criticized as someone who had a bad heart, stood firm and strong, supported freedom in the world, and demanded that Gorbachev tear down the Wall. This is what changed the world. It was his strength of character, even when he was being criticized personally and undermined every step of the way for political purposes, he stood strong

and the will of the Communist bosses in Moscow crumbled, for the first President they ever had to stand up, who really believed in freedom and democracy and was willing to make that part of America's offensive policy against Communist tyranny.

That changed the world. It has made it safer. It gave us the opportunity to spend less money, hundreds of billions of dollars less on a national defense over the years. We would never have had that respite, except that Ronald Reagan stood firm. When people said, let us have a nuclear freeze that leaves the Soviet Union in a dominant position, Reagan said no. If we are going to do anything with nuclear weapons, it has to leave us both on par. We will have a mutual reduction of nuclear weapons, and that is exactly what happened. They said it could never be done, and they called him a war monger for demanding something that could never happen, that the Communist bosses would never agree to.

Mr. Speaker, we are all the recipients of Ronald Reagan's wisdom. We all are benefiting from the strength of character of this man who carried us from uncertainty and in retreat and left an America on the rise, an America that was growing economically, but an America that was reinvigorated in its commitment to freedom and justice and to treat the people of the world decently. We captured, we captured the hearts and souls of the people throughout the world, the young people, especially those in the Soviet Union.

Today, we should take heed of what Ronald Reagan did and remember, those people in Iraq are our greatest ally. Those people in China are our greatest ally, those people who want democracy and freedom and suffer under their tyranny; and we should be on their side and we too can make this a better and more peaceful world as Ronald Reagan did. We are grateful to Ronald Reagan. Happy birthday, Ronald Reagan. We are grateful to you. We really appreciate it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons that have been articulated by my esteemed colleagues, I urge adoption of this measure.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to recognize former President Ronald Reagan's ninety-second birthday and his unceasing commitment to our great nation.

In 2000, Congresswoman JENNIFER DUNN, the late Senator Paul Coverdell, and I introduced legislation to bestow the Congressional Gold Medal to President Reagan and his beloved wife, Nancy, in honor of their dedicated service to the United States.

The Reagans formally received their Congressional Gold Medal last May, at a special ceremony here in the Capitol.

Upon passage of the Reagan Congressional Gold Medal bill, Mrs. Reagan remarked, "it means a lot to us to receive so much support at this difficult time, and we are very honored."

Yet, honor and fame were never priorities for Ronald Reagan, and his journey to the White House was not marked by a desire for power or position.

He preferred to see himself as a simple citizen who was called upon to serve the nation he so loved.

Ronald Reagan truly is a great American, in every sense.

Led by his belief in the limitless potential of Americans, President Reagan turned the tide of public cynicism and sparked a national renewal.

During his eight year tenure, the United States enjoyed a period of astonishing economic growth, military superiority, and international change.

Ronald Reagan's contagious optimism and passionate patriotism served as an inspiration to the entire nation. Under his leadership, Americans believed, once again, in the American Dream.

As we enter the 21st Century, our Nation still finds its strength in President Reagan's ideals and his steadfast confidence in democracy, freedom, and America.

Often, as Americans, we look back at our history to learn from our mistakes and celebrate our triumphs.

The leadership and accomplishments of President Reagan certainly will not be forgotten, for they shaped the country we call home and the world as we know it today.

Thank you President Reagan for your commitment, dedication, and faith in America and her people.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I gladly recognize and congratulate President Ronald Reagan on his 92nd birthday. However, I voted present because I could not in good conscience support a resolution that goes beyond simply offering personal well wishes and endorses President Reagan's economic policies.

I do not believe President Reagan's legacy of monumental budget deficits and excessive tax cuts for the rich was good economic policy. I don't believe his policies renewed America's economic prosperity. Instead they left too many Americans behind and left a giant bill we are still paying today.

I am sorry that the authors of this resolution felt it necessary to insert such partisan language. It would have otherwise been a completely non-controversial resolution that I would gladly support it.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American and our 40th President—Ronald Reagan. He is a man who not only inspired a generation, but led a Nation through one of its most challenging eras. His inspiration has carried well beyond his public years and will influence Americans well beyond our years in Congress.

Let us never forget that the very policies we fight for every day on the House floor—increased defense spending, tax relief, homeland security and fiscal discipline—have the fingerprints of Ronald Reagan all over them. It was his leadership and ingenuity decades ago that serve as the very foundation of our legislative agendas today.

Ronald Reagan not only inspired a Nation—He inspired the world to follow a path of progress and humanity in a decade plagued with the threat of communist tyranny. Today, we face a similar battle—this time against the threat of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. While Ronald Reagan may not be leading us in this battle, let us follow the path that he blazed over a decade ago. Should we follow the principles of his leadership, the blanket of freedom and democracy over America will only grow stronger.

Let me also note that it would not be appropriate to honor President Reagan without honoring the person that has heroically stood by his side with complete dedication and unwavering commitment. Nancy Reagan's commitment to her husband, parallels President Reagan's commitment to this Nation. Her daily struggle to confront a disease that has taken away the true voice and spirit we continue to rally around is nothing short of heroic and should inspire this entire Nation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring President Reagan on his 92 birthday by supporting H.J. Res. 19.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 19.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 395, DO- NOT-CALL IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House H.R. 395; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; that the bill be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage, without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2002 NCAA DIVISION I NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) congratulating the University of Portland women's soccer team for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I national championship.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 41

Whereas, on December 8, 2002, the University of Portland women's soccer team captured its first ever undisputed collegiate national soccer championship;

Whereas the 2002 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I title is the first championship in any sport for the University of Portland;

Whereas the University of Portland Pilots' 20-4-1 record in 2002 tied the record for wins in a season in University of Portland women's soccer history;

Whereas head coach Clive Charles, the University of Portland director of women's and men's soccer, has successfully built a nationally recognized collegiate soccer program, leading the University of Portland women's and men's teams to a collective 12 conference championships and 16 NCAA playoff berths, and producing players for the United States National and Olympic teams;

Whereas, on the way to the national championship, the Pilots defeated 7 nationally ranked opponents, which included a 2-1 title game triumph over the reigning champion, Santa Clara University;

Whereas the Pilots, the tournament's number 8 seed, now hold the record as the lowest seeded-team to win the national title in the women's national championship 21-year history;

Whereas sophomore Christine Sinclair set an NCAA tournament record with 21 points on 10 goals and 1 assist;

Whereas each player, coach, trainer, and manager dedicated time and effort to ensuring that the Pilots reached the pinnacle of team achievement; and

Whereas the students, alumni, faculty, and supporters of the University of Portland are to be congratulated for their commitment and pride in the Pilots' women's soccer program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the University of Portland women's soccer team for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I national championship and recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, and support staff who were instrumental in this accomplishment;

(2) requests that the President recognize the accomplishments and achievements of the 2002 University of Portland women's soccer team and invite them to Washington, D.C., for a White House ceremony for national championship teams; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled copies of this resolution to the University of Portland for appropriate display and to transmit an enrolled copy of the resolution to each coach and member of the 2002 University of Portland women's soccer team.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 41.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 41. This resolution recognizes and honors the talent and accomplishments of the University of Portland women's soccer team.

In December, the Pilots won their first-ever national title in a 2-to-1 win over Santa Clara University at the 2002 NCAA Women's College Cup. The Pilots ended their season with an impressive 20 win, 4 loss, 1 tie record.

The Pilots' victory exemplifies the determination and dedication that is a hallmark of collegiate athletic programs. A national championship is an accomplishment that will characterize the University of Portland's women's soccer team as a viable competitor for years to come.

Congratulations are in order to Head Coach Clive Charles and the entire women's soccer team at the University of Portland. I am happy to join the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) in honoring this extraordinary team in all of its accomplishments, and I wish all involved a very successful future.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 41 congratulating the University of Portland's women's soccer team for winning the NCAA Division 1 championship.

On December 8, the University of Portland captured its first national championship. In fact, this is the University of Portland's first national championship in any sport.

I want to start by extending my congratulations to Head Coach Clive Charles and to all of the athletes on the University's winning squad.

Winning a championship brings national acclaim to a school, and the team's players and fans should treasure this exciting moment.

While it is important that we focus on this victory, it is also critical to recognize how opportunities for women in sports have grown and the impact of title IX.

□ 1615

This win by the University of Portland Women's Soccer Team reminds us of the value and importance of this landmark statute.

Unfortunately, Title IX is once again under attack. The administration's Commission on Opportunity in Athletics recently proposed so-called reforms to Title IX that would undermine this important civil rights statute. The commission's reports would recommend that girls and women be provided less athletic opportunity than boys and men by loosening protections and safeguards that have existed for many years. The commission was formed by Secretary Paige to advance the administration's agenda to weaken the opportunity for women and girls on the athletic field.

With Title IX successes over the 3-plus decades of its existence why would we want to weaken it now? Women now constitute more than 40 percent of

those involved in college athletics, as opposed to 15 percent in 1972.

While we may be confronted with proposals to change Title IX, I would advise the administration not to propose initiatives to weaken this critical law.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and the rest of the Oregon delegation for introducing this resolution, and again to extend my congratulations to the University of Portland's Women's Soccer Team.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me time and the kind words both he and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) had.

It is an honor to recognize the outstanding achievement of the NCAA Women's Soccer champions from the University of Portland to share with the rest of the country the excitement in Portland as the Pilots brought home the university's first national championship.

It must be noted that this is not just an achievement of an outstanding group of young women. It is a symbol of the achievement of an outstanding institution in Portland, Oregon. Once a small regional Catholic college, the University of Portland has grown in prestige and esteem, drawing a diverse student body from across the United States and around the world. The U.S. News and World Report last year ranked the university as one of the top five regional universities in the Nation.

The faculty, students and trustees can be justly proud of the accomplishments of the last quarter century under the leadership of Father Paul Waldschmidt, the late Father Tom Oddo, and more recently, President David Tyson.

The leadership of these presidents and trustees has had a tremendous impact on the academic programs and the physical development of the campus. But the University of Portland's Women's Soccer Team symbolizes that level of achievement, commitment and dedication. The Pilots Women's Soccer Team has for over a decade compiled an outstanding record, six times reaching the highest levels in play-off competition. But one must understand that these players are students first.

The University of Portland has one of the highest rates of graduating student athletes among the NCAA Division I colleges and universities across the country.

The soccer program at the University of Portland has produced women athletes who are today household names in the soccer world like Tiffeny Millbrett, Shannon MacMillan, both

Olympians. They are role models for our community, for young women in Portland and around the country.

I have watched my own daughter and her high school teammates be inspired by their example. I have watched these outstanding college athletes share their skill and knowledge of the game with children in the community. Part of this achievement is due to the outstanding coach, Clive Charles who, along with leading the Pilots to victory on the field, recently fought and won a difficult battle against cancer. He is one of only five coaches in NCAA history to win 400 games. All of those, we are pleased to say, are with the University of Portland.

Even by the university's high standards, this particular win was special. This determined team fought from the eighth seed in the tournament to take it all, as has never been done before in college cup history. While one hesitates to single out specific players on this outstanding team, four Pilots were named to the all-tournament team, including Sinclair, Arase, defender Lauren Orlandos, and midfielder Erin Misaki.

I would be remiss not to mention the numerous records that were broken by the team in this effort. Christine Sinclair set an NCAA tournament record with 21 points on 10 goals and one assist, shattering Mia Hamm's 1993 record of 16. Lauren Arase allowed just one goal in the 2002 play-offs, setting an NCAA record for play-off goals, an average of 0.016, allowing just one goal in six games. Her gutsy effort was recognized in a recent New York Times article chronicling her will to push on despite a terrible injury in the championship game, illustrating the continued significance of Title IX.

The Pilot women who brought this title are the pride of an outstanding university. There is no more fitting symbol of the power and purpose of women's athletics than their championship. I am pleased that President Bush will honor the team with a White House ceremony later this month, and I am pleased the House of Representatives is honoring them today with this resolution.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only appropriate, particularly in light of the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for us to acknowledge at this time that after the tragic passing of our colleague Patsy Mink, Title IX was named after Patsy Mink and will forever carry that name.

Secondly, I think it is important to understand that the opportunities provided by Title IX were the underpinning which allowed teams like the Portland Pilots Women's Soccer Team to reach the heights of achievement in NCAA collegiate athletics. All of us in this House are proud of the achievements of women's teams at the collegiate level and are committed to the continuing excellence of women's ath-

letics and men's athletics at the collegiate level, without the exclusion of anyone. And I feel honored to have been one to have known Mrs. Mink, and I am honored today to acknowledge that Title IX has been named after Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) has been very supportive of Title IX, and he and I shared our great admiration of Mrs. Mink. I appreciate his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating the women of the University of Portland Soccer Team for winning the NCAA Division I National Championship. But let us not forget that we must also congratulate Patsy Mink's Title IX program, because if there were no Title IX, there would not be a soccer championship for women.

Before Title IX, fewer than 30,000 girls participated in intercollegiate athletics. Today, more than 100,000 women compete. In high school, fewer than 7 percent of the young women played varsity sports prior to Title IX. Today, over 40 percent of young women do.

Do these games mean that the work of Title IX is finished when it comes to sports, that it is time for the supporters of the Title IX to take their ball and go home? Absolutely not. Is contrary to the scare tactics being used by opponents of Patsy Mink's Title IX program, those who say that women's sports are eating up all the athletic funding. The facts show that women's sports continue to receive far less funding than men's sports.

In the community of Duquesne, Pennsylvania, girls' sports receive one dime, one thin dime, for every dollar spent on boys' sports.

In my own State of California, where women make up over 56 percent of the full-time students at our 108 State colleges, women's sports receive 35 percent of the athletic budget.

In Georgia, more than 86 percent of the legislative grants for stadiums, lighting and equipment at public schools went to boys' sports programs. That would be 86 percent.

So while Title IX is transforming the playing field for women's sports, and that is because of our late colleague, Patsy Mink, we are not close to being even between men's sports and women's sports. We must be strong and we must continue to support Title IX; otherwise the dream of an NCAA championship will not be alive for girls in their future.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) wait for just a minute? I want to make a clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I think I heard that in the State of Georgia 85 percent of the money appropriated by the legislature went to men's athletic facilities.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISAKSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, that is what I believe I said.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, it is unconstitutional and illegal in the State of Georgia for the State to spend any tax money on athletic facilities. Those all have to be done either privately by booster clubs in the secondary schools, and in post-secondary schools by the foundations of the universities. But we cannot in the State of the Georgia spend any public money on athletic facilities. I just wanted to make that clarification.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I do not think I said Federal funding. I am sure I said funding in general.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, there was no State funding. That is the point I want to clarify.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That is too bad because investment in girls' sports is an investment in their future.

Mr. ISAKSON. We are investing in their education and urging them to raise the funds to support their athletics, men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I rise again to congratulate the University of Portland's Women's Soccer Team and to voice my concern about changing the regulations of Title IX.

I come from an "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" school, and Title IX sure ain't broke.

Let me say something about if we just educate women. We are very much concerned about the health of young people in the United States and the sedentary lives that they live. It certainly would make a lot of difference if we give all women the opportunity to develop themselves athletically so they can pass that on to their children. Remember, if we want to have all those boys for the Georgia football games, we sure better have mothers who know how to bring them up right.

Senator Birch Bayh sponsored Title IX in 1972 because women in the United States were not getting an equal chance to participate in athletics and other educational opportunities. And since Title IX was enacted, both women's and men's participation in athletics has increased. But equality of opportunity still does not exist for our girls.

On an average, men participate at higher rates than women and they get 35 percent more scholarship dollars

than women, and their total operating budgets are always double, at least, those of women's sports. And yet the critics of Title IX argue that the male athletes are suffering because of Title IX.

Mr. Speaker, Title IX ain't broke, but I will tell you what is. Some college football teams with rosters exceeding 100 athletes get to stay at four-star resorts before every home game. That is broke. Women do not get to do that. Athletic departments deciding that they would rather eliminate a wrestling program than to trim down the men's multimillion-dollar basketball budget, and then they blame the loss of the wrestling team on the women. That is not only broke, that is lame.

The Commission on Athletic Opportunity mistakenly complaining that Title IX invokes a quota system and then in their recommendations they suggest a real numerical quota. That is broke and it is downright un-American.

I urge my colleagues to support the spirit of Title IX and Patsy Mink that so pervades this House. She fought so valiantly for it and for most of her life really was so concerned that something might happen to it. Keep it as it is and keep it as it has been for the last 30 years so that women and girls today, including the women who have graduated from the University of Portland, who now have a women's professional soccer team to look forward to, will not lose the opportunities that they have earned; and never take that away from them.

Certainly in 1972 we seemed to discover here and in State legislatures that we have women constituents too. It would really behoove us not to forget that.

□ 1630

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 41, congratulating the University of Portland women's soccer team for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I national championship. In addition to bringing home that trophy to the university, the Pilots fielded the first sophomore to be recognized as the Nation's top collegiate soccer player.

How could we have gotten there? I believe the accomplishment of these women is especially poignant as the Bush administration considers making changes to title IX, the 1972 landmark legislation which bans discrimination against women and schools and which is responsible for unprecedented gains in the participation of women in sports.

In the 30 years since the enactment of title IX, participation of girls in high school varsity teams has gone from one in 27 to one in three. Female participation in varsity collegiate sports has also risen to over 150,000,

and we have already seen the gains that women have made in the Olympics. We have seen our United States athletes win in those Olympic games. Why? Because of title IX.

Overall, as a direct result of title IX, we have made great strides. So why are we trying to stop that? Why are we trying to change title IX? We should not, because the progress that we make on the soccer field extends to other places, well beyond that playing field.

Girls who play sports are 80 percent less likely to have unwanted pregnancies. They are three times more likely to stay in school and 92 percent less likely to use drugs. So now is not the time to change title IX.

High school girls continue to miss out on opportunities. There are 1.1 million less athletic slots in high schools in the Nation for girls as compared to guys. College women receive less money, \$133 million less spent on women's sports than on men's sports at the collegiate level.

Instead of focusing on title IX, we should figure out how we divvy up the profits that come from some of our athletic teams to ensure that everybody gets the opportunity to be on the playing field if they want to be there.

Again, congratulations to the University of Portland's women's soccer team, but remember that it is people like Patsy Mink who went ahead and fought for our rights and laid the groundwork so girls could play. Remember that and help us.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time and my friend from Georgia for helping bring this bill to the floor.

I congratulate the women of the University of Portland on their outstanding achievement of winning the NCAA Division I soccer championship, and their achievement gives us pause to look backward at the world that their mothers lived in and forward to the world in which their daughters will live.

The world in which the mothers of these outstanding champions lived frowned on the idea of young women playing sports. We did not fund it. We did not support it. We discouraged it in ways that not only failed to enrich the lives of little girls but failed to enrich the lives of their brothers and boy counterparts.

When the mothers of these women were in high school and college, athletic opportunities for young women were the exception, not the rule. That changed because title IX was enacted over 3 decades ago, because women of vision like the late Patsy Mink stood here and made sure that it was enacted.

We have not only the opportunity to congratulate the women of the University of Portland; we have the opportunity to protect this opportunity for

their daughters as well. Because here we are again, over 3 decades later, and the basic premises of title IX are being questioned by some in this body and in this country.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the obligation we have to our daughters is to make sure that the principle of title IX, which is equality of opportunity for men and women in sports, carries through into the future so that the daughters of these champions that we honor today will have equal or greater opportunities when compared to those shared by their mothers.

These women are an inspiration to girls and young women across the country. Last week, a 10-year-old soccer player competing in a winter indoor soccer league scored three goals in two games. She is an outstanding young woman. I hope that one day she will stand in the shoes of these outstanding champions from Oregon. Her name is Jacquelyn Andrews. She is my daughter.

So I say to Patsy Mink and I say to the women that we honor today, I thank them for the inspiration they have given the daughters of America. Let us live up to that inspiration and protect the legal principles of title IX.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will just take a minute and close, if I can. The original purpose of this resolution is to commend an outstanding university in the Pacific Northwest. It is the women's soccer team that won the NCAA Division I championship, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for that, and I support it.

I also realize it is an opportunity to pontificate on title IX, and I am very proud of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and others who have acknowledged the achievements of this body long before I got here in providing access and opportunity to collegiate athletics to women at a time in which those were deprived.

I think it is unfortunate to take a positive resolution like this, however, and speculate that a review 30 years later of title IX is an attack. In fact, if anything, because of the richness that title IX has brought to intercollegiate athletics, the benefits it has brought to athletics for women, the opportunities, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) says, it was given to Olympic sports to raise America's participation and success in the Olympics is a foundation for it to be perfected and improved for the future, not attacked or demeaned.

So I am not suspect of any commission reviewing any operation that after 30 years has proven to be successful and carried out its intended progress, and I am very happy to have had an opportunity to commend a group of young women who reached the highest achievement in their field in the

United States of America, the Portland Pilots. I commend them, Clive Charles, their coach, my colleagues, and title IX.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, in this time of war, recession, and national tragedy, it is important for us to emphasize the positive and reflect on the great achievements and moments that we have shared in the past year. I rise today to honor the University of Portland's women's soccer team for its outstanding achievement in the intercollegiate championship.

On December 8, 2002, the University of Portland women's soccer team captured its first collegiate national soccer championship. This achievement is even more special because it is also the first national championship in any sport for the University of Portland. Under the leadership of head coach, Clive Charles, the University of Portland Pilots, the tournament's number 8 seed, defeated seven nationally ranked opponents, including a 2-1 title game triumph over the reigning champion, Santa Clara University. The Pilots now hold the record as the lowest-seeded team to win the women's national championship in its 21 year history.

I applaud Coach Charles for the program he has helped build at the University of Portland. He has successfully built a nationally recognized collegiate soccer program, leading the University of Portland women's and men's teams to a collective 12 conference championships and 16 NCAA playoff berths, and producing players for the United States National and Olympic teams.

But it is the players that I truly want to congratulate today. Cristin Shea, Betsy Barr, Imani Dorsey, Rebekah Patrick, Kristen Moore, Erin Misaki, Kristen Rogers, Wanda Rozwadowska, Emily Patterson, Christine Sinclair, Kelsy Hollenbeck, Lauren Orlando, Jennifer Bosa, Valerie Fletcher, Lindsey Huie, Lauren Arase, Jessica Heller, Colleen Salisbury, and Kim Head have all dedicated numerous hours and much hard work ensuring their team's success. Their efforts paid off! In addition to this title, a number of players walked away with new records. Sophomore Christine Sinclair now holds or ties NCAA playoff records for goals and points in a game (3 goals, 1 assist vs. Richmond), goals in tournament (10), and points in a tournament (21). And Lauren Arase allowed just one goal in the 2002 playoffs, setting an NCAA record for playoff goals against average (0.16), allowing just one goal in six games.

This team is a tribute to Oregon and to Portland. It is also a tribute to the long-term benefits of Title IX, which gives hope to this team and to the young women who are rising through the ranks of sports all across the playing fields of America. I congratulate the players on their stunning victory, and I wish them even more success in the years ahead!

Ms. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H. Res. 41, to congratulate the University of Portland women's soccer team for winning the 2002 National Championship. Congratulations to the team and their coach for an amazing season.

The University of Portland's Soccer Team is just another wonderful example of the success of Title IX.

When I was growing up in New York, girls weren't given many opportunities to play league sports and were instead encouraged to cheer the guys on or play a smaller version of

their game, but certainly not to participate at the same competitive level as men.

But in 1965 Patsy Mink came to Congress and she changed the education opportunities offered to women. She fought to bring equality to our colleges and universities and for the first time ever, girls were given the opportunity to play sports at the same level as boys.

Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a successful federal program Title IX is it. Today, five times as many women play college sports, and an incredible 10 times as many play high school sports as in 1972 the year Title IX passed.

From basketball to soccer, we have seen women sports programs flourish. I am truly proud of the soccer players in Oregon and I am thrilled to be a supporter of Title IX.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today we rise to congratulate the University of Portland women's soccer team and Coach Clive Charles, on their 2002 Division I national title. As a former coach of young women athletes in Oregon, I recognize the commitment to endless practice and debilitating repetition that winning requires.

The University of Portland Pilots women, in addition to making the sacrifices necessary for victory, represent the competitiveness, resolve, and success that collegiate athletics exist to foster. I urge the recognition of their recent feats as evidence of the triumph of the American spirit through sporting achievement, as well as the positive influence of Title IX on American society.

The Pilots' road to the national championship required them to defeat seven squads that held coveted national rankings, proof that their opponents were among the Nation's finest.

Those seven wins serve as a testament to the Pilots' collective commitment to playing hard, even against competition of the highest caliber. Surely there is no greater evocation of the collegiate athletic spirit than the competitiveness exhibited by the University of Portland women in those hard-fought wins against well-respected opponents.

After a solid regular season, the Portland women entered the championship playoff as an eighth-seeded longshot to earn the eighth-seeded longshot to earn the title. Nevertheless, they emerged as the lowest seeded team ever to win the tournament.

The resolve necessary to prove rankings obsolete and critics wrong does not come without effort. In fact, many of us encourage our daughters and sons to participate in athletics with the express hope that they might develop a touch of that trait. With the University of Portland's women's soccer championship, we are reminded that resolve, the persistence in a goal despite exorbitant odds, is at least as important as size, talent, or experience. Undoubtedly, the Portland women have drawn on the strength and perseverance of their coach and leader, Clive Charles, whose battle with illness illustrates the victory over circumstance that we admire in collegiate athletics.

Finally, in developing a national championship program, the University of Portland women's soccer team was animated by the desire to stack the building blocks of victory upon one another, to complete a project born of the architecture of accomplishment. A national title came to the University of Portland not through unprecedented fortuitous circumstance, but from the execution of a plan for success. Concentration on conference titles and tournament

berths provided the women's soccer program a foundation of achievement on which it has placed a structure of greatness. In doing so, the Portland women have made the most important point about collegiate athletics.

These women display the character built by extended effort, the satisfaction reaped by the tireless pursuit of a goal, and the success within reach of all who are given an opportunity.

Let us also take this moment to remember that opportunity seized is dependent upon opportunity granted. Without Title IX, our discussion of women's soccer at the University of Portland might center on its lack of a team, rather than on its team's national championship. When women have the chance to compete in scholarship athletics at the collegiate level, we introduce into society a more competitive, balanced, and healthy universe of graduates.

Title IX has extended the opportunity to compete to thousands who would not have had it otherwise. The University of Portland women attest to the potential of opportunities granted by Title IX.

Again, I ask that we salute the 2002 National Champion University of Portland women's soccer team. May we look to them, now and in the future, as an exemplary symbol of what we hope to gain through our commitment to collegiate and scholastic athletics.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 41.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING CALCULATION OF FEDERAL SUBSIDY RATE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 141) to improve the calculation of the Federal subsidy rate with respect to certain small business loans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 141

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SUBSIDY RATE FOR SMALL BUSINESS LOANS.

Notwithstanding section 502(5)(F) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 and section 254(j) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in calculating the Federal cost for guaranteeing loans during fiscal year 2003 under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)), may use the most recently approved subsidy cost model and methodology in conjunction with the program and economic assumptions, and historical data which were included in the fiscal year 2003 budget. After written notification to Congress, the Small Business Administration shall implement the validated, OMB-approved subsidy rate for fiscal year 2003, using

this model and methodology. Such rate shall be deemed to have been effective on October 1, 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 141.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the very distinguished Committee on Small Business chairman, my neighbor and friend, brought to me a problem of the government overestimating SBA loan defaults and thereby excessively limiting the total number of small business loans made to small businesses in this country, brought that to my attention.

This was happening because OMB and SBA, the Office of Management and Budget and Small Business Administration, were insisting on using old data predating recent SBA loan reforms. We have been working together with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) to resolve this problem ever since.

Over a year ago, language was included in the fiscal year 2002 Treasury appropriations conference report requiring OMB and SBA to report to us on how and when the problem was going to be fixed. That report indicated that the problem would be addressed in the 2003 budget with the development of new economic models, which it was not.

Last year, the SBA subsidy rate problem was not fixed. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and I wrote to OMB Director Daniels requesting that the 2003 calculation be reviewed and that the subsidy rate be resubmitted to reflect a more accurate projection of the anticipated costs. Again, they were not.

Now, with the subsidy rate still not fixed, we offer this legislation as the solution, together with our colleagues in the other body. It will require that a new, better econometric model already developed by SBA and approved by OMB be implemented for the current fiscal year 2003 for calculating the 7(a) subsidy rate. This effectively requires OMB to follow through with their promise on a new model once and for all.

This model should now provide a more accurate estimate of defaults in the past, present, and future loan portfolio performance to better estimate

the true cost to the government of guaranteeing these important loans to our small business community. This is a detriment because the Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires any and all losses from expected borrower defaults to be covered by the government in advance with an up-front appropriation. Therefore, a lower default rate means that the same amount of money goes out a lot further and covers many more loans due to the multiplier effect.

I am sure there are many small business people in our districts that have been contacting us about this. For me, I have a small business friend of mine, Bill Werger from Manchester, Iowa, who helped highlight this issue for me as he continues to struggle to open small businesses and provide economic development to a small town in Iowa.

I believe that if this is done correctly, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and I expect that this result will be in the billions of dollars of additional loans being made to the small businesses of this country. This is critical because this program will help many of those small businesses during this economic recovery with cautious lenders still limiting access to capital to very willing borrowers.

The SBA 7(a) program attacks this problem by guaranteeing these borrowers between 50 and 85 percent of the loans, as high as \$2 million, for virtually every business purpose.

Equally important to me as the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, however, this bill will not do this without directing the budgetary scoring of this correction; or in other words, it will require the problem be fixed by correcting the process and not by predetermining the outcome illegitimately. It does this by allowing the use of the most recently approved subsidy cost model and methodology but with the program and economic assumptions and the historical data which we included in the President's original fiscal year 2003 budget submission.

In other words, the Manzullo-Nussle-Snowe bill that we have before us today fixes the small business subsidy rate problem, thereby greatly increasing the number of loans to small businessmen and small businesswomen without compromising the process that OMB calculates the real cost to the Federal Government of providing these subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me thank the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Small Business. He has been tenacious in bringing this issue to the forefront, not only of my committee, the Committee on the Budget, but also to the attention of the Congress. He is a real champion of small business, and he is somebody that I am honored to have worked with very hard on this process. So I want to commend him on the bill that we have before us.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Small Business; the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member; and my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for facilitating the legislation before us. This is not only good, but necessary, legislation. I am glad to see us move it.

S. 141, this bill before us, would allow the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, to change its 2003 technical assumptions regarding the SBA general business program. Without this change, everybody should understand this, SBA will have to reduce the 2003 loan volume supported by this program by about 50 percent, 50 percent below the 2002 level of \$9.3 billion.

□ 1645

This legislation was referred to our committee, the Committee on the Budget, because it required an exception to the usual strictures of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act that bind OMB to one set of assumptions throughout a budget year. That is why it is necessary for us to bring it to the floor. I guess we could call this directed scorekeeping, but in this case it is justifiable scorekeeping.

OMB has had chronic problems with overestimating the credit subsidy rate for general business loans, the so-called 7(a) program and related programs. As a result, SBA has historically underestimated the volume of loans that can be supported by a given level of appropriations. Starting with the 2004 budget, this problem should be corrected because OMB has developed a much more sophisticated and accurate model for estimating the subsidy rates. For this fiscal year, 2003, however, the President declined to request sufficient appropriations to maintain the program level for general business loans, given this existing estimate of the subsidy rate.

Consequently, SBA is now on the horns of a dilemma. It can either reduce the maximum size of loans made to individuals or it can suspend the program once it runs out of authority before the end of this fiscal year. Neither of those is an attractive option, especially not now, in the midst of a very, very slack economy. We are struggling to get back on our feet and get people back to work. This legislation is proemployment legislation because, with the adjustment we make by this legislation, SBA will be able to support a 2003 loan volume of about \$8.2 billion, which is close to its historic standard of \$9 to \$10 billion.

I enthusiastically support this legislation and I urge everyone to give it their support. It could create and should create additional jobs. It will certainly iron out a problem for small business borrowers and the SBA for the balance of this fiscal year, something we need to do and should do, and it is good legislation to boot. I urge everyone to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, and I ask unanimous consent that she be given the ability to allocate that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his bipartisan approach to this bill. It truly is a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Small Business, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to allocate the time accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank again the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for his leadership. And I also want to thank, in particular, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for the tremendous work that she has put into this. If there is any name to be placed on this bill, her name should have a prominent place on it.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses are having a tough time obtaining credit around the nation. The Small Business Administration's 7(a) and 504 loan guaranty programs are a vital source for nearly \$13.5 billion of new capital to small businesses every year. Over 48,000 small businesses are served each year by these programs. In fact, the 7(a) program alone provides 40 to 50 percent of all the long-term financing that goes to small businesses, which have led to the creation of thousands of small firms, contributing to job creation and economic growth.

However, last October, the SBA cut back both the amount of loans made and the maximum loan size under the 7(a) Loan Guaranty Program. This hurts companies like Ryden Heavy Hauling of Woodstock, Illinois, which is caught in a credit limbo while we try to fix this problem.

Initially, Ryden sought an SBA guaranteed loan of \$1 million to generate eight new full-time and part-time jobs and sustain the jobs of the 16 employees already working at Ryden. However, Ryden has been caught in a credit squeeze, and it could only apply for a loan of \$500,000, creating serious ramifications that impact their future growth. We need to pass S.141 as one step in the process to lift the SBA-imposed loan caps.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter I received from Ryden Heavy Hauling in this regard.

RYDEN HEAVY HAULING INC.

Woodstock, IL, February 7, 2003.

Congressman DON MANZULLO,
181 North Virginia Ave.
Crystal Lake, IL.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Ryden Heavy Hauling provides transportation services for persons or companion looking to haul heavy equipment. Major customer segments include the Construction, Utility and Manufacturing industry.

The mission of Ryden Heavy Hauling, Inc. is to be the most reliable heavy hauling company servicing the Midwest. Ryden Heavy Hauling prides itself in hiring the best drivers, competitive pricing and updating and maintaining equipment to insure the highest level of safety for our customer's equipment.

We strive to support the economy by expanding and creating additional jobs to stimulate the business community.

We presently are applying for an SBA backed loan in the amount of \$500,000.00 dollars. Originally we asked for \$1 Million but the cap for the SBA guarantee was dropped to \$500,000.00 dollars. This decision has created serious ramifications that impact our future growth.

Our projected program will generate 8 new full-time and part-time positions as well as retain the existing 16 jobs in our work force.

Therefore it is in the interest of the business community to reinstate the original limit of \$2,000,000.00 so companies like Ryden Heavy Hauling can survive.

Respectfully,

LEONARD R. RYDEN,
President.

Mr. Speaker, how did we get in this situation in the first place? In December 2001, the President signed into law a provision to reduce fees charged to borrowers in the 7(a) program, starting on October 1, 2002. The 7(a) program has netted the government handsome profits every year, taxing small businesses more than \$1.4 billion over the last 10 years beyond the cost of operating the program.

This is all because of an overly conservative credit subsidy calculation model used by SBA and the Office of Management and Budget that requires charging more fees than is necessary to cover potential bad loans. This model simply averages the annual default rate going back to 1986, even though Congress dramatically changed the 7(a) Loan Guaranty Program in the 1990s that made the program more safe and secure for the taxpayer. Yet current small business borrowers are now penalized, in their ability to access one of the few remaining sources of credit, for old mistakes in a program that have been changed.

This is the worst possible time for these actions. Small businesses create over three-quarters of the new jobs in the U.S. S.141 begins to correct the problem. The bill simply authorizes OMB to adopt a new economic model for calculating the 7(a) program subsidy rate to take effect this fiscal year, beginning October 1 of 2002. The General Accounting Office has long advocated this approach. SBA has already developed and OMB has approved an econometric model for the 7(a) program in the 2004 budget cycle. OMB pledged to use this model for 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD, a letter dated November 14,

2002 from OMB Director Daniels and addressed to me regarding this subject matter.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, November 14, 2002.

Hon. DONALD A. MANZULLO,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of November 12, regarding the subsidy rate for small business loans.

As you know, the Administration is committed to improving the Small Business Administration's (SBA) ability to more accurately estimate the cost of subsidizing small business loans. This will enable the agency to allocate its resources more effectively, determine program risk more precisely, and increase its ability to target loan programs to the most deserving recipients.

In accordance with the commitment that the Administration one year ago, the Office of Management and Budget has just approved SBA's 7(a) econometric subsidy model to calculate its fiscal year 2004 resource requirements. Further, in light of the fact that this improved subsidy calculation procedure is now available, the Administration would support legislation that allows us to implement the econometric model for fiscal year 2003 as well. Applying the econometric model would produce a subsidy rate of 1.04 percent rather than 1.76 percent submitted in the FY 2003 budget.

Please let us know if you need any more information.

Sincerely,

MITCHELL E. DANIELS, JR.,
Director.

The subsidy rate using an econometric model in 2003 dramatically drops from 1.76 percent to 1.04 percent, a 41 percent reduction.

S. 141 allows SBA to guarantee \$3.4 billion in new lending to the small businesses. Congress must now act to increase access for small business lending. To its credit, the administration was the first to recognize the problem and begin to work on solutions within a few months of taking office. Their willingness to retroactively use the econometric model for 2003 in the 7(a) program is another example of their openness to finally correct this festering problem.

However, OMB cannot change the assumption in the President's 2003 budget request on their own after its proposal has already been sent to Congress. That is why we are here today for a legislative remedy.

The same cooperation should also extend to the 504 program. The subsidy rate calculation error in the 504 is proportionately a bigger problem than the 7(a). There is some question as to whether or not S. 141 would cover the Supplemental Terrorist Activity Relief loan program, known as STAR. STAR loans have always been viewed by the SBA as a subset within the 7(a) program.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD two SBA procedural notices and a copy of the statutory language creating the STAR loan program.

SBA PROCEDURAL NOTICE

To: To All Employees.

Subject: Guidelines for Implementation of the Fee Reduction on Loans to Small Business Adversely Affected by the Terrorist Activities of September 11, 2001.

SBA Procedural Notice 5000-775 provided information regarding the 7(a) program fee reduction authorized in the Defense Appropriations Act of 2002 which was signed into law on January 11, 2002. The purpose of this notice is to provide more detailed guidance on the implementation of that fee reduction. In order to distinguish loans made under the Defense Appropriations Act from other 7(a) loans made during the same period, loans with the fee reduction will be known as "Supplemental Terrorist Activity Relief" ("STAR") loans.

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON SBA'S ANNUAL FEE

Section 7(a)(23) of the Small Business Act authorizes SBA to collect an annual fee on each outstanding SBA guaranteed loan equal to 0.5 percent (50 basis points) of the guaranteed share of the outstanding balance of the loan. The Defense Appropriations Act authorized a reduction in that fee from 0.5 percent to 0.25 percent (25 basis points) for loans made to small businesses adversely affected by the September 11th attacks. This reduced fee will apply for the life of the loan. Both the original and temporarily reduced fees are subject to the provisions of Section 7(a)(23)(B) which states that this fee is "... payable by participating lender and shall not be charged to the borrower."

2. PERIOD OF APPLICABILITY

The reduction in the annual fee is effective for eligible loans approved (funded) by SBA between January 11, 2002, and January 10, 2003, or until the approximate \$4.5 billion program level provided for this initiative has been used up, whichever occurs first.

Any 7(a) loan approved before January 11, 2002, will continue to be subject to the 50 basis points fee, subject to the following exception. If the lender finds that a borrower that had its 7(a) loan approved prior to January 11, 2002, was adversely affected by the terrorist actions, AND, if the loan is fully undisbursed; the lender may cancel the approved loan and submit a new application which will then meet the criterion of having been approved after January 10, 2002. If SBA approves the new loan, a new loan number must be issued.

3. DEFINITION OF "ADVERSELY AFFECTED" SMALL BUSINESS

As indicated in the previous notice, for purposes of the STAR program, the term "adversely affected small business" means a small business that suffered economic harm or disruption of its business operations as a direct or indirect result of the terrorist attacks perpetrated against the United States on September 11, 2001. Some examples of economic harm are: difficulty making loan payments on existing debt; difficulty in paying employees or vendors; difficulty in purchasing materials, supplies, or inventory; difficulty in paying rents, mortgages, or other operating expenses; and, difficulty in securing financing. As previously noted, SBA does not intend that this list be considered all-inclusive. The Agency anticipates that there will be other circumstances that are appropriate for use to illustrate that a business has suffered economic harm or a disruption of its business operations. Agency guidance should not be construed as limiting eligibility to any particular geographic area or to any specific type(s) of business. A loan to a start-up business may qualify for the STAR program if, for example, the business planned to commence operations earlier, but

its ability to do so was hampered by the terrorist actions and their aftermath.

SBA believes that a high percentage of businesses finding it necessary to seek SBA-guaranteed financing may be found to have been adversely affected by the terrorist actions. In order to qualify for the reduced fee, however, the lender must: (1) find that the loan applicant was adversely affected by the terrorist events of September 11, 2001; and, (2) prepare and maintain in its loan file a write up summarizing its analysis and its conclusion that the loan is eligible for the STAR program. A lender will not be found to have met its responsibility for determining that a borrower was adversely affected if the lender statement merely states that conclusion, but does not provide a narrative justification demonstrating the basis for the conclusion.

4. STEPS REQUIRED FOR LENDER TO SUBMIT A STAR PROGRAM APPLICATION

In order for a loan to qualify as a loan under STAR, the SBA lender must:

(a) Determine that the applicant business was "adversely affected" by the terrorist activity of September 11, 2001, and must document the basis for this conclusion in its loan file. This documentation must be available for review by SBA, but need not be submitted to SBA.

(b) Indicate that the loan is being submitted under the STAR program by writing "STAR Loan" at the top of the SBA Form 4-1, "Lender's Application for Guaranty or Participation," or 4-L, "Application for LowDoc Loan," as applicable.

(c) Amend the loan authorization provision regarding the on-going fee to be paid to SBA on the loan to indicate that the fee will be 0.25 percent per annum.

5. COLLECTION OF THE REDUCED FEE

Lenders will submit to Colson Services, Inc. (Colson), the 0.25 percent fee using the same SBA Form 1502 process as it uses for other SBA loans. SBA will provide Colson with a list of loans that are subject to the lower fee. As with all other fee collections, Colson will work with a lender to make any necessary corrections to the fee and reporting submissions.

6. PLP/SBAEXPRESS/COMMUNITY EXPRESS

The PLP center will provide additional direction to PLP lenders regarding STAR program requirements.

7. PROCESSING STAR LOAN REQUESTS

The SBA Loan Accounting Tracking System (LATS) has been modified to provide a STAR program indicator to track STAR loans. Data must be entered into this indicator field as follows: (1) An "S" must be entered for any loan submitted by the lender under the STAR program; and, (2) An "N" (for "no") must be entered for any non-STAR loan. This data must be completed for each loan (including a 504 loan) even if the loan is not STAR eligible.

When the STAR Indicator is filled in with an "S", it will mean that:

(a) The lender has informed SBA that the loan is eligible for the STAR program;

(b) The lender will be charged the reduced 0.25% annual fee;

(c) The loan will be subject to the STAR program subsidy rate; and

(d) The loan will be funded out of the separate STAR loan fund.

There are four sets of circumstances that may occur in connection with a loan that is potentially eligible for the STAR program. The attachments to this Notice (described below) provide instructions for SBA's data input under each of these circumstances.

A. NEW LOAN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY A LENDER AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS NOTICE

The Star program Indicator field shown on LAS001 must be completed as part of the

data input for all new loan applications. For any loan designated by a lender as a STAR loan, the "S" designation must be entered. For any non-STAR loan the "N" designation must be entered. [Attachment A provides instructions for processing a STAR-qualified loan submitted to SBA by a lender after the effective date of this notice.]

B. RE-CLASSIFICATION OF A LOAN AFTER SUBMISSION, BUT PRIOR TO SBA APPROVAL

If a loan was originally input as a non-STAR loan, but prior to SBA's approval, the lender provides a written request to SBA to reclassify the loan as a STAR loan, the SBA processing office must use the LSA005 Screen to input an "S" in the STAR program indicator field. [Attachment B provides instructions for re-classifying a loan as a STAR-qualified loan after SBA's initial data input, but prior to SBA approval.]

C. RE-CLASSIFYING A LOAN AS A STAR LOAN AFTER APPROVAL BUT BEFORE DISBURSEMENT

For any loan approved by SBA on or after January 11, 2002, that was not initially classified as a STAR loan; if, subsequent to SBA approval and prior to any disbursement, the lender provides a written request to SBA to reclassify the loan as a STAR loan, the SBA field office servicing the loan must:

1. Verify that the loan is fully undisbursed;
2. Prepare a SBA Form 327 action to support cancellation of the regular 7(a) funded loan and re-instatement of the loan as a STAR loan;
3. Cancel the existing loan, thus returning the regular 7(a) funds to the regular 7(a) program account; and,
4. Wait at least one business day after completing step 3 and reinstate the loan and enter an "S" in the STAR Indicator on LAB00 screen.

[Attachment C provides instructions for re-classifying a fully undisbursed loan as STAR-qualified after approval by SBA.]

D. RE-CLASSIFYING A LOAN AS A STAR LOAN AFTER FULL OR PARTIAL DISBURSEMENT

If a loan was approved by SBA on or after January 11, 2002, and is partially or fully disbursed when the lender makes a written request that the loan be reclassified as a STAR loan, two additional steps must be taken. First, SBA must reverse the amount disbursed to show a loan balance of zero. Then, after the proper classification is entered, SBA must re-enter the amount disbursed to return the loan to its actual condition. [Attachment D provides instructions for re-classifying a partially or fully disbursed loan as a STAR loan.]

9. POST APPROVAL MODIFICATIONS

Any increases to an existing STAR loan or reclassifications of a non-STAR to a STAR loan must be completed prior to January 10, 2003, or before the use of all available funds, whichever occurs first. After expiration of the STAR program authority, any additional required funding will require a new loan application processed under the regular 7(a) program. For small increases, lenders may want to establish separate side notes.

10. REFERRALS FROM THE DISASTER PROGRAM

As you are aware, after the September 11th attacks, SBA published regulations that expanded the availability of the Agency's Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) program to small businesses which have suffered substantial economic injury as a direct result of the terrorists attacks and certain related Federal action. See 66 Federal Register 53329 (October 22, 2001). Despite this program expansion, however, there may be some circumstances where a small business that is found ineligible for an EIDL loan may be found to qualify for a STAR loan. Therefore, when appropriate, the Office of Disaster As-

sistance (ODA) will advise a business that it may qualify for other SBA assistance, and may refer such business to the appropriate SBA field offices. Field staff should be prepared to discuss SBA's loan programs, including STAR, with the businesses, and should also make referrals for assistance to one of the Agency's management and technical assistance partners, when appropriate.

11. QUESTIONS

Lenders should contact their loan SBA field office for more information regarding the STAR program. Field staff with questions on how to input data to classify a loan as a STAR loan should contact David Kimble at (202) 205-6299. SBA staff with questions on any other issues related to STAR should contact A. B. McConnell, Jr. at (202) 205-7238.

JANE PALSGROVE BUTLER,

*Associate Administrator
for Financial Assistance.*

SBA PROCEDURAL NOTICE

To: All SBA Employees.

Subject: Reduced Fee for New 7(a) Loans Made to Businesses Adversely Affected by September 11th Terrorist Attacks.

The Defense Appropriations Act, signed by President Bush on January 10, 2002, reduces the ongoing fee charged to the lender on new 7(a) loans made to small businesses that were "adversely affected" by the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and their aftermath. The legislation makes no other changes to 7(a) program fees, or to the 504 loan program.

Under the new law, the on-going fee for eligible 7(a) loans is reduced from 0.5 percent (50 basis points) of the outstanding balance of the guaranteed portion of the loan to 0.25 percent (25 basis points). This fee reduction is effective for the full term of eligible loans approved by SBA during the 1 year period beginning January 11, 2002 and ending January 10, 2003, or until the funds available for this purpose are expended, whichever occurs first.

SBA has received an appropriation that will allow the Agency to fund up to approximately \$4.5 billion in eligible loans. Since the fee income received by SBA on loans made under this provision will be different from that received on regular 7(a) loans, these loans will have a different subsidy rate and will be tracked separately for subsidy rate purposes.

ELIGIBILITY

For purposes of implementation of this legislative provision, the term "adversely affected small business" means a small business that has suffered economic harm or disruption of its business operations as a direct or indirect result of the terrorist attacks perpetrated against the United States on September 11, 2001. Some examples of economic harm are: difficulty in making loan payments on existing debt; difficulty in paying employees or vendors; difficulty in purchasing materials, supplies, or inventory; difficulty in paying rents, mortgages, or other operating expenses; and, difficulty in securing financing. SBA does not intend that this list be considered all-inclusive. The Agency anticipates that other circumstances can illustrate that a business has suffered economic harm or a disruption of its business operations.

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Each lender making a reduced fee 7(a) loan under the provisions of the new law is responsible for determining that the loan is being made to a small business that was adversely affected by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. For each such loan, the lender must prepare, place, and keep in its loan file, a short written statement documenting the basis for its conclusion that the

loan is eligible for inclusion under this provision.

All other existing SBA 7(a) loan requirements, including credit requirements, apply to loans made under the provisions of the new law.

Loans made under this statutory provision must be identified with a special code that will alert SBA and the SBA Fiscal and Transfer Agent (Colson Services Corp.) to calculate the appropriate on-going fee.

A follow-up Procedural Notice will be issued shortly with additional guidance for implementation of these special requirements.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Field offices should provide this notice to all participating lenders immediately.

Lenders and other interested parties should contact their local SBA field offices for more information. SBA field staff should contact James Hammersley, Director, Loan Programs Division, at (202) 205-7505.

JEANNA M. SCLATER,
*Acting Associate Deputy
Administrator for Capital Access*

P.L. 107-117—DIVISION B, SECTION 203

SEC. 203. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the limitation on the total amount of loans under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) outstanding and committed to a borrower in the disaster areas declared in response to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks shall be increased to \$10,000,000 and the Administrator shall, in lieu of the fee collected under section 7(a)(23)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(23)(A)), collect an annual fee of 0.25 percent of the outstanding balance of deferred participation loans made under section 7(a) to small businesses adversely affected by the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and their aftermath, for a period of 1 year following the date of enactment and to the extent the costs of such reduced fees are offset by appropriations provided by this Act.

These documents make it clear that STAR loans have been made under the umbrella of the SBA 7(a) loan program. The only reasonable interpretation is that S. 141 apply its econometric model to STAR loans made since October 1, 2002. This would also provide an additional \$1.1 billion in guaranteed lending to small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Committee on Small Business, working in close partnership with the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, which has legislative jurisdiction over the issues of the Credit Reform Act, was able to bring S. 141 up on the floor in such an expeditious manner.

I want to particularly thank the staffs of both committees for working together to bring the bill to the floor. I also want to commend my Senate counterparts, Senators SNOWE and KERRY, and particularly the former chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator KIT BOND of Missouri, for all their hard work on the matter. We would not be here today without these diligent bipartisan efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on sending S. 141 to the President's desk for signature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of S. 141. This legislation is long overdue. Today, more than ever, small businesses struggle to find avenues of capital. This is only reinforced by the fact that in our day and age, the number one rate for entrepreneurs to finance their great idea is through credit cards. Oftentimes, these carry prohibitively high interest rates, weighing small businesses down with insurmountable debt even before they get off the ground.

Filling this financing vacuum are the SBA loan programs. Through public-private partnerships that share the lending risk, small businesses are able to tap into capital that is both affordable and accessible. In these programs last year, \$20 billion in capital, accounting for 40 percent of all long-term small business lending, was provided to this Nation's entrepreneurs.

Unfortunately, at a time when we need these programs the most, they are blocked from fulfilling their true potential because of policies that place the Federal Treasury's bottom line above this Nation's small business bottom line. Over the last decades, both lenders and small businesses receiving SBA loans have been overcharged by a whopping \$1.5 billion. This is nothing more than a tax on small business that should have been put to rest long ago.

S. 141 will help to change this inequity by requiring the administration to more accurately report the cost of these programs to taxpayers. The move will begin to turn the tide of this unfair tax, and coupled with the pending fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill, entrepreneurs will finally have the access to capital they need.

I urge my colleagues to join me in calling on the President to follow through on our actions today and put capital where it belongs, in the hands of small business owners.

Mr. Speaker, for almost 6 months now, this administration has limited access to capital for the small business sectors by placing a cap of \$500,000 on SBA loans. This move is tantamount to credit rationing. Because of these actions, entrepreneurs have been blocked from accessing billions of dollars. These funds could have been used to create economic growth and jobs, two important components to aid us in our climb out of the current economic doldrums.

With the passage of this measure, the SBA and the administration will no longer have an excuse to withhold these funds from small businesses, and they must lift this cap.

While this legislation offers some remedy, it is only a very minor move in terms of what truly needs to happen to give the small business community the fairness it deserves. With this bill's implementation we will see the first significant reduction in the subsidy rate governing the program. But even with the passage of S. 141, small busi-

nesses and lenders are still paying too much, and that must change.

Even more importantly, this legislation does nothing to address the most egregious practice of taxing small business, the overcharging of those entrepreneurs who use the 504 loan program.

The average small business owner today, receiving a 504 loan, can expect to pay an additional \$15,000. That is the difference between hiring a part-time employee and a full-time employee, providing health care benefits or purchasing new equipment that will add jobs. This is shameful. But the fact that the administration is aware of this and their current budget refuses to fix it is without conscience. I am not going to stand for this. Small business owners are not going to stand for it either. And this body should not stand for it.

Mr. Speaker, S. 141 is the first step in helping Main Street America, but there is still a lot of work to be done before small firms receive fair and equal treatment. One of our mantras in the Committee on Small Business is "Access to capital is access to opportunity." With the passage of this legislation, we will be a little closer to making it possible for thousands of individuals to realize the American dream of business ownership. I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), and working in concert with the ranking member is proof positive that we can address the problems facing the Congress in a bipartisan way. The gentleman has not just talked about it, he has done it. It is nice to talk about these things, but we do not see it too much around here.

I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman and the ranking member, but this goes beyond subsidy rates as I perceive it. It is heartening to know that on this particular day we can pause from debating which deficit-exploding tax cut for the wealthy should be enacted and instead actually do something for the small businessman instead of just talking about it.

After 2 years of economic malaise, we are now in the weakest level of economic growth in 50 years. I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) has pointed out, if we are ever going to make this change and address it, now is the time to do it when there is an economic downturn. People are working harder for less. Household in-

come for the bottom 95 percent of wage earners has fallen. Too many Americans are searching long and hard for work, work they cannot find; and consumer confidence is at its lowest point in a decade. Businesses throughout my district, the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, are hurting.

If we truly want to propel ourselves from this downturn, we must realize that small businesses are fundamental components to our economic infrastructure. Entrepreneurs have been and will continue to be the backbone of our great economy. It is absolutely critical that we provide those entrepreneurs with some relief, not just pay them lip service. So passage of S. 141 will be the first in what I hope will be many steps in a bipartisan way to address the problems of small businesses.

This bill expands the size of the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program as I see it. This program is the largest effort within SBA to help smaller companies obtain loans from bank and other conventional sources. Lending programs such as this are critical for small business start-up. Access to capital is access to opportunity.

Unfortunately, according to a variety of sources, not least of which is the GAO, current policies have resulted in overcharging the 7(a) loan program's lenders and borrowers by \$1.5 billion over the last 10 years. Who paid that?

This legislation is aimed at forcing the administration to use a subsidy rate model that accurately reflects the cost of small business and small business loan programs to the taxpayer. It aims to improve the calculation of the Federal subsidy rate for small business lending. It will provide a new cost calculation, as has been pointed out graphically here, which is expected to reduce the subsidy rate from 1.76 percent to 1.04 percent, thereby expanding the program itself by \$4.9 billion to \$8.2 billion, which will be available which is not available now. That will happen just by changing that rate.

But there are other things that need to be done. As the ranking member has pointed out, in the 504 lending program, this is critical. This is small business taxation which is unnecessary. The failures of this administration to adjust problems with the 504 program have left small businesses paying \$15,000 for each loan, and I think the average loan is about \$200,000. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), have spoken about this time and time again. We cannot accept that. It is unacceptable. That money could be used to expand the very program that we are here trying to address today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with this. This will go into effect October 1, 2002, so it will be retroactive to the very beginning of this fiscal year. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and the ranking member for doing this very well.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for their leadership in the Committee on Small Business. I rise today in strong support of S. 141 as introduced by Senator SNOWE and passed by the Senate. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy, especially in times of financial crisis, and this bill is important because it would help to reduce the cost of small businesses throughout the United States.

S. 141 would encourage the administration to use a 7(a) subsidy rate model that would more accurately reflect the true cost of the small business loan programs to the taxpayer. The current model has resulted in overcharges of \$1.5 billion over the last 10 years, according to the GAO study. The measure authorizes the Office of Management and Budget to adopt a new econometric model for calculating the program subsidy rate. The change would enable the SBA to boost 7(a) lending authority from \$4.8 billion to \$8.2 billion for fiscal year 2003 by significantly reducing the 7(a) credit subsidy rate.

The bill's projected impact on small business lending should result in near 21,000 more loans to small firms with a potential to support at least 103,000 new jobs. Moreover, implementing the new econometric model will not require any increase in Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, S. 141 simply requires SBA to use the new econometric model a year earlier than planned and thus enable small businesses to benefit from the lower subsidy rate immediately. The new model will reduce the cost to both the lender and the borrower. The change combined with reprogramming of unused STAR funds will yield a 7(a) program level of \$9 million below the demand, but it is sufficient to lift the current administration-imposed cap that has hurt small businesses since October 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Chairman MANZULLO and Ranking member NYDIC VELÁZQUEZ for their leadership in the Small Business Committee!

I rise today in strong support of S. 141, as introduced by Senator SNOWE and passed by the Senate. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy, especially in times of financial crisis, and this bill is important because it would help to reduce the costs to small businesses in the United States. S. 141 would encourage the Administration to use a 7(a) subsidy rate model that would more accurately reflect the true cost of the small business loan programs to the taxpayer. The current model has resulted in overcharges of \$1.5 billion over the last 10 years, according to a GAO Study.

The measure authorizes the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to adopt a new econometric model for calculating the pro-

gram's subsidy rate. The change would enable the SBA to boost 7(a) lending authority from \$4.8 billion to \$8.2 billion for Fiscal Year 2003 by significantly reducing the 7(a) credit subsidy rate.

The bill's projected impact on small business lending should result in nearly 21,000 more loans to small firms—with the potential to support at least 103,690 new jobs. Moreover, implementing the new econometric model will not require any increase in federal spending.

Currently, the 7(a) Program is operating at a reduced capacity from previous years, with the size of loans capped at \$500,000. The shortfall in lending authority leaves many small firms nowhere to go for money to maintain or expand their operations in a slow economy. Each year, 40,000 or more small business concerns that cannot obtain comparable credit elsewhere turn to the 7(a) program for critically-needed financing.

To combat this problem, the SBA contracted with the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) to construct an econometric model that considers additional factors with the goal of representing a more accurate cost. Developed by the SBA and the OMB, the econometric model will use far more comprehensive data about individual borrowers and loans when forecasting anticipated defaults and establishing loan reserves to cover them.

SBA has finished the review and plans for the implementation of the new model in FY04. This delayed implementation would leave the current model in place for FY03. The difference in the two models is approximately 70 basis points, 1.07 v. 1.77, which is roughly a \$1,000 difference annually per loan.

Each year, the Office and Management and Budget (OMB) calculates the federal cost of guaranteeing small business loans administered by the Small Business Administration.

Critics of the current method of calculating those costs argue that it does not take into account historical data and recent statutory and regulatory changes that have improved default rates and program performance. Critics therefore contend that the current federal cost, expressed in the form of a subsidy rate, is overestimated, which, in turn, limits the amount of loans that can be guaranteed. Again, a recent General Accounting Office report supports this contention.

S. 141 simply requires SBA to use the new econometric model a year earlier than planned and thus enables small businesses to benefit from the lower subsidy rate immediately. The new model will reduce the cost to both the lender and the borrower. The change, combined with reprogramming of unused STAR Funds, will yield a 7(a) program level of \$9 billion below the demand, but it is sufficient to lift the current Administration imposed cap that has hurt small businesses since October of 2002.

For these reasons, I rise in strong support of passage S. 141 and urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), an alumna of the Committee on Small Business and the newest member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, although no longer on the Committee on Small Business, I am still here to fight on behalf of small businesses, and I am pleased to join my colleagues today as we celebrate this piece of legislation coming to the floor.

The passage of S. 141 is an important step that can be taken by Members to help small businesses. Over the past 4 years when I served on the Committee on Small Business, we worked hard to see that legislation that would assist small businesses would get to the floor and pass. It is wonderful that I will be able to say to my constituents, yes, one more time we have done something for small business. It is the first crucial step this body can take to provide the necessary infusion of capital to small businesses and help them retain and create jobs and provide a needed boost to our economy.

In my congressional district, there are a number of people who are not counted in that number of unemployed because they have not been seeking a job because there are no jobs available to them. This is a wonderful step. The 7(a) program is very important, and it can make a difference for a lot of our entrepreneurs.

While this is a first step in the right direction, it just begins to address some of our concerns. Among those is the issue of opening up the SBA 7(a) program to more credit unions. I have been working with credit unions across this country trying to make that available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to come to the floor and say to the chairman and ranking member, let us keep it up. I join my colleagues in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the House of Representatives considering this legislation today. As we are too painfully aware, our economy is in a state of disarray, and among the many consequences of this is the struggle by many small businesses to stay in existence in these uncertain times. Passage of S. 141 is one important step that can be taken by Members of this body to help those small businesses that contribute so much to our economy, our entrepreneurial spirit, and our national well-being continue to thrive and grow.

Small business is in fact big business, accounting for over 75 percent of the jobs held in this country and an equally large percentage of the gross national product. For small businesses to grow and create jobs, infusions of capital are critical. Yet recent actions by the Administration do little to increase the bottom line of America's small business, with less than 3 percent of the President's economic stimulus plan being targeted at small businesses. By focusing on such narrow concerns as eliminating dividend taxes, the Administration has left small businesses out of the equation for stimulating the economy. (Pause) The Administration has left a creator of 75 percent of the country's jobs out of the equation for stimulating the economy . . . focusing instead on incentives for investing in the stock market when incentives for investing in the job market are what is needed for a much needed stimulus.

S. 141 is the first crucial step this body can take to provide that necessary infusion of capital to our small businesses, help small businesses retain and create jobs, and provide a needed boost to our economy. This bill will work to reverse the practice of taxing small businesses through use of a subsidy rate model that will more accurately reflect the cost of SBA loan programs, accelerate the use of this new subsidy rate, and allow the SBA to lift imposed lending caps to small businesses. Without this bill, small businesses will be left with the burden of overpaying an average of \$15,000 for some of the loans they need to run and expand their businesses.

And while this bill is a major step in the right direction, it just begins to address some of the concerns arising out of small business loan programs provided by the SBA. Among those is the issue of opening up the SBA 7(a) program to more credit unions, an action that the SBA Administrator's discretionary authority allows, an action that would give credit unions the same authority to offer SBA guaranteed loans enjoyed by other federally insured lenders.

I am voicing my support for S. 141 because it will provide immediate relief for entrepreneurs in search of capital to finance their companies. And as these entrepreneurs are able to grow and thrive, so too will our economy. Remember, small business is big business and small business focuses on the "market" that matters—the job market. I thank my colleagues for joining me in supporting S. 141.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me say that we are going to miss the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) on the committee, and request a waiver from the Democratic leadership that she be on the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Small Business at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

S. 141 is a good start. It is time to stop finger-pointing and get to work. The administration needs to lift the loan cap and get this critical capital where it is needed most, in the hands of small businesses.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 141, a bill authorizing the Office of Management and Budget to adopt a new econometric model for calculating the 7(a) Guaranteed Loan Program's subsidy rate.

The subsidy rate for the 7(a) program has not accurately reflected the actual performance of these loan portfolios since the passage of the Credit Reform Act in 1990.

The continuous over statement of the subsidy rate resulted in the Small Business Administration cutting back both the amount of loans and the maximum loan size under its highly effective Section 7(a) loan program. The SBA has reduced the maximum 7(a) loan size they can guarantee from \$1 million to \$500,000. The 7(a) loan program is a vital source for nearly \$11 billion of new capital for small businesses every year.

Passage of S. 141 and the adoption of the new econometric model will enable the SBA to boost 7(a) lending authority from \$4.8 billion to \$8.2 billion for Fiscal Year 2003. This model

will reduce the 7(a) credit subsidy rate, and should prevent any further economic damage from cuts to the largest federal assistance program for small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, as we look to small businesses to restore economic growth, we must allow the Office of Management and Budget to modernize its credit subsidy calculation model. I thank you for the opportunity to speak and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to offer my support for S. 141, long overdue legislation that will require the Office of Management and Budget to use a new subsidy rate model for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program. This new model will more accurately reflect the true cost of this federal loan program to American taxpayers.

As a Ranking Member of the House Committee on Small Business, this issue is of vital importance to the hard-working entrepreneurs of my district, the 37th District of California.

Over the past few years, the House Committee on Small Business has held a number of hearings to address this issue, as small firms have been levied excessive fees for participating in the 7(a) loan program.

Recent estimates tell us that as much as 1.5 billion dollars over the past ten years has been returned to the Treasury of the United States at the expense of hard-working small business owners.

While the SBA currently has an alternative model, they have delayed its implementation until Fiscal Year 2004.

The passage of S. 141 will force the new model to be used immediately, allowing SBA to lift a lending cap imposed on the 7(a) program last year and provide small businesses long-awaited relief for entrepreneurs in search of capital to finance and expand their companies.

Small businesses are fundamental players in lifting the American economy out of its current doldrums and without investment resources this cannot and will not occur.

Passage of S. 141, will be the first step in correcting this wrong and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for passage of this important piece of legislation.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 141, a bill to improve the calculation of the federal subsidy rate with respect to small business loans of the Section 8(a) program.

As a member of the Commerce-Justice-State Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee which has funding jurisdiction for the Small Business Administration and its loan portfolio, I know that this is an issue we have wrestled with from year to year. I am pleased to see that we are finally acting affirmatively on behalf of small businesses. Everyone recognizes that small businesses represent the engine of U.S. economic growth.

The issue has to do with credit subsidies for small business loans. Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget has refused to modernize its credit subsidy calculation models. A recent General Accounting Office study reported that OMB's models do not take into account historical data and recent statutory and regulatory changes that have improved default rates and program performance. As a result, OMB over-estimates the current subsidy rate that, in turn, limits the level of loans that can be guaranteed.

SBA loan programs are especially critical in California, and I was contacted by a number of large banks in Los Angeles County about the detrimental impact that these poor calculations would have meant to small business start-up loans. The Section 7(a) program provides more than 50% of the long-term credit that goes to small businesses in California. Our costs are higher than many other states, so a 50% cut in loan levels required by OMB's policies hit California and other high-cost states disproportionately.

Last October, I was pleased to work with Rep. DARRELL ISSA and the California Bankers Association in organizing a letter to Speaker HASTERT pointing out this problem and the severe impact it would have on California's small businesses. Over 30 of my California colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, joined us in signing and sending the letter to Speaker HASTERT. I am pleased to see that Speaker HASTERT has responded to our concerns and the concerns of other states to place this bill before the House today.

This legislation directs the Office of Management and Budget to calculate the federal costs of guaranteeing small business loans. OMB would be required to use the most recently approved subsidy cost model and methodology in conjunction with the program, economic assumptions, and historical data which were included in the president's FY 2003 budget request. More importantly, the Small Business Administration would implement the new subsidy rate and deem it to have been in effect since October 1.

The bill is intended to provide a new cost calculation methodology, which is expected to reduce the subsidy rate from 1.76% to 1.04%, thereby expanding the size of the program from \$4.9 billion to \$8.2 billion.

That is good news for small businesses in my congressional district, in California, and across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. This bill will give a big lift to small businesses, and they, in turn, will help lift our economy out of its current slump.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 141 to improve the calculation of Federal subsidy rate with respect to 7(a) loans.

The 7(a) loan program is one of the two Small Business Administration's primary lending programs and is a major source of capital for our nation's small businesses. Lending through the SBA loan programs currently represents 40-percent of all small business lending. Last year, the SBA lent a record 20 billion dollars of which 12 billion was in the 7(a) loan program.

While Congress fights to increase appropriations for the 7(a) program, our efforts are frustrated by a miscalculated subsidy rate. It is estimated that since 1995, 7(a) lenders and borrowers have over paid by some \$400 million plus dollars for using the program. This overcharging is simply another name for small business tax. Passage of S. 141 will be the first step in correcting the SBA lending problems plaguing our nation's small businesses. This legislation would force the Administration to use a subsidy rate model that accurately reflects the cost of the small business loan programs to the taxpayer. The change will provide immediate relief for entrepreneurs in search of capital to finance and expand their companies.

I urge the passage of S. 141.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 141 to improve the calculation of the federal subsidy rate with respect to certain small business loans.

Although, each year the Office of Management and Budget calculates the federal cost of guaranteeing small business loans administered by the Small Business Administration. Many analysts believed the current method of calculating those costs does not take into account historical data and recent statutory and regulatory changes that have improved default rates and program performance. Therefore, they contend that the current federal cost, expressed in the form of a subsidy rate, is overestimated, which, in turn, limits the amount of loans that can be guaranteed.

The bill S. 141 would authorize the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to calculate the Federal cost for guaranteeing small business loans under the Small Business Act during FY 2003 and to use the most recently approved subsidy cost model and methodology that would take into account economic assumptions and historical data included in the FY 2003 budget. The bill is intended to provide a new cost calculation methodology, which is expected to reduce the subsidy rate from 1.76 percent to 1.04 percent, thereby expanding the size of the program from \$4.9 billion to \$8.2 billion.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 141.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 141.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X and clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of

January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. GALLEGLY of California,

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 27, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 22, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 61, by the yeas and nays;

H.J. Res. 19, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CONDEMNING THE SELECTION OF LIBYA TO CHAIR THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 27.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 27, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 6, answered “present” 8, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billrakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert

Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter

Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint

Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Ruppersberger
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone

Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)

Turner (TX)	Wamp	Wilson (NM)
Udall (CO)	Watson	Wilson (SC)
Udall (NM)	Waxman	Wolf
Upton	Weiner	Woolsey
Van Hollen	Weldon (FL)	Wu
Velazquez	Weldon (PA)	Wynn
Visclosky	Weller	Young (AK)
Vitter	Wexler	Young (FL)
Walden (OR)	Whitfield	
Walsh	Wicker	

NAYS—6

Clay	Kucinich	Paul
Honda	Lee	Rahall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8

Ballance	McDermott	Waters
Hinchey	Miller, George	Watt
Kilpatrick	Stark	

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (UT)	Ford	Platts
Cannon	Gephardt	Reyes
Conyers	Hulshof	Rush
Cubin	Marshall	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Ferguson	Neal (MA)	Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). The Chair reminds the Membership that there is less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1849

Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. WATSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. STARK and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed their vote from "nay" to "present."

Mr. McDERMOTT changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

Stated for:

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 20, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 20, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

HONORING CZECH REPUBLIC
PRESIDENT VACLAV HAVEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 22.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BE-REUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 22, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Ackerman	Delahunt	Jackson-Lee
Aderholt	DeLauro	(TX)
Akin	DeMint	Janklow
Alexander	Deutsch	Jefferson
Allen	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Andrews	Diaz-Balart, M.	John
Baca	Dicks	Johnson (CT)
Bachus	Dingell	Johnson (IL)
Baird	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Baker	Dooley (CA)	Johnson, Sam
Baldwin	Doolittle	Jones (NC)
Ballance	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Barrett (SC)	Dreier	Kanjorski
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Kaptur
Barton (TX)	Dunn	Keller
Bass	Edwards	Kelly
Beauprez	Ehlers	Kennedy (MN)
Becerra	Emanuel	Kennedy (RI)
Bell	Emerson	Kildee
Bereuter	Engel	Kilpatrick
Berkley	English	Kind
Berman	Eshoo	King (IA)
Berry	Etheridge	King (NY)
Biggert	Evans	Kingston
Bilirakis	Everett	Kirk
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Klecza
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Kline
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Knollenberg
Blackburn	Filner	Kolbe
Blumenauer	Flake	Kucinich
Boehlert	Fletcher	LaHood
Boehner	Foley	Lampson
Bonilla	Forbes	Langevin
Bonner	Ford	Lantos
Bono	Fossella	Larsen (WA)
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)
Boucher	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Boyd	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Bradley (NH)	Frost	Leach
Brady (PA)	Gallegly	Lee
Brady (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Levin
Brown (OH)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Gillmor	Linder
Ginny	Gingrey	Lipinski
Burgess	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Burns	Goode	Lofgren
Burr	Goodlatte	Lowey
Burton (IN)	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Buyer	Goss	Lucas (OK)
Calvert	Granger	Lynch
Camp	Graves	Majette
Cantor	Green (TX)	Maloney
Capito	Green (WI)	Manzullo
Capps	Greenwood	Markey
Capuano	Grijalva	Marshall
Cardin	Gutierrez	Matheson
Cardoza	Gutknecht	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Hall	McCarthy (MO)
Carson (OK)	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Carter	Harris	McCollum
Case	Hart	McCotter
Castle	Hastings (FL)	McCrery
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Chocola	Hayes	McGovern
Clay	Hayworth	McHugh
Clyburn	Hefley	McInnis
Coble	Hensarling	McIntyre
Cole	Herger	McKeon
Collins	Hill	McNulty
Combest	Hinchey	Meehan
Conyers	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Cooper	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Costello	Hoefel	Menendez
Cox	Hoekstra	Mica
Cramer	Holden	Michaud
Crane	Holt	Millender-
Crenshaw	Honda	McDonald
Crowley	Hooley (OR)	Miller (MI)
Culberson	Hostettler	Miller (NC)
Cummings	Houghton	Miller, Gary
Cunningham	Hoyer	Miller, George
Davis (AL)	Hunter	Mollohan
Davis (CA)	Hyde	Moore
Davis (FL)	Inslee	Moran (KS)
Davis (IL)	Isakson	Moran (VA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Israel	Murphy
Davis, Tom	Issa	Murtha
DeFazio	Istook	Musgrave

Myrick	Rogers (AL)	Strickland
Nadler	Rogers (KY)	Stupak
Napolitano	Rogers (MI)	Sullivan
Neal (MA)	Rohrabacher	Sweeney
Nethercutt	Ros-Lehtinen	Tancred
Ney	Ross	Tanner
Northup	Rothman	Tauscher
Norwood	Roybal-Allard	Taylor (MS)
Nunes	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Nussle	Ruppersberger	Terry
Oberstar	Ryan (OH)	Thomas
Obey	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Olver	Ryun (KS)	Thompson (MS)
Ortiz	Sabo	Thornberry
Osborne	Sanchez, Linda	Tiahrt
Ose	T.	Tierney
Otter	Sanchez, Loretta	Toomey
Owens	Sanders	Towns
Oxley	Sandlin	Turner (OH)
Pallone	Saxton	Udall (CO)
Pascrell	Schakowsky	Udall (NM)
Pastor	Schiff	Upton
Paul	Schrock	Van Hollen
Payne	Scott (GA)	Velazquez
Pearce	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Pelosi	Sensenbrenner	Vitter
Pence	Serrano	Walden (OR)
Peterson (MN)	Sessions	Walsh
Peterson (PA)	Shadeegg	Wamp
Petri	Shaw	Waters
Pickering	Shays	Watson
Pitts	Sherman	Watt
Pombo	Sherwood	Waxman
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Weiner
Porter	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Portman	Simmons	Weldon (PA)
Price (NC)	Simpson	Weller
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Wexler
Putnam	Slaughter	Whitfield
Quinn	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (NM)
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Wilson (SC)
Ramstad	Snyder	Wolf
Rangel	Solis	Woolsey
Regula	Souder	Wu
Rehberg	Spratt	Wynn
Renzi	Stark	Young (AK)
Reynolds	Stearns	Young (FL)
Rodriguez	Stenholm	

NOT VOTING—19

Ballenger	DeLay	Rush
Blunt	Ferguson	Smith (TX)
Boozman	Gephardt	Tauzin
Cannon	Hulshof	Tiberi
Cubin	Miller (FL)	Turner (TX)
Davis (TN)	Platts	
Deal (GA)	Reyes	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind the Membership that there is less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1856

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 21 I was inadvertently detained. (Had I been present, I would have voted "yea.")

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 21 had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 21, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMENDING ISRAEL ON THEIR
ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 61.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 61, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 2, answered “present” 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Crane	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hayes
Akin	Crowley	Hayworth
Alexander	Culberson	Hefley
Allen	Cummings	Hensarling
Andrews	Cunningham	Herger
Baca	Davis (AL)	Hill
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hinchee
Baird	Davis (FL)	Hinojosa
Baker	Davis (IL)	Hobson
Baldwin	Davis (TN)	Hoefel
Ballance	Davis, Jo Ann	Hoekstra
Ballenger	Davis, Tom	Holden
Barrett (SC)	DeFazio	Holt
Bartlett (MD)	DeGette	Honda
Barton (TX)	Delahunt	Hooley (OR)
Bass	DeLauro	Hostettler
Beauprez	DeLay	Houghton
Becerra	DeMint	Hoyer
Bell	Deutsch	Hunter
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hyde
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Inslee
Berman	Dicks	Isakson
Berry	Dingell	Israel
Biggart	Dooley (CA)	Issa
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Istook
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Dreier	Jackson-Lee
Bishop (UT)	Duncan	(TX)
Blackburn	Dunn	Janklow
Blumenauer	Edwards	Jefferson
Boehlert	Ehlers	Jenkins
Boehner	Emanuel	John
Bonilla	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Bonner	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Bono	English	Johnson, E. B.
Boozman	Eshoo	Johnson, Sam
Boswell	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Boucher	Evans	Jones (OH)
Boyd	Everett	Kanjorski
Bradley (NH)	Farr	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Keller
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Kelly
Brown (OH)	Filner	Kennedy (MN)
Brown (SC)	Flake	Kennedy (RI)
Brown, Corrine	Fletcher	Kildee
Brown-Waite,	Foley	Kilpatrick
Ginny	Forbes	Kind
Burgess	Ford	King (IA)
Burns	Fossella	King (NY)
Burr	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Klecza
Calvert	Frost	Kline
Camp	Garrett (NJ)	Knollenberg
Cantor	Gerlach	Kolbe
Capito	Gibbons	Kucinich
Capps	Gilchrest	LaHood
Capuano	Gillmor	Lampson
Cardin	Gingrey	Langevin
Cardoza	Gonzalez	Lantos
Carson (IN)	Goode	Larsen (WA)
Carson (OK)	Goodlatte	Larson (CT)
Carter	Gordon	Latham
Case	Goss	LaTourette
Castle	Granger	Leach
Chabot	Graves	Lee
Chocola	Green (TX)	Levin
Clay	Green (WI)	Lewis (CA)
Clyburn	Greenwood	Lewis (GA)
Coble	Grijalva	Lewis (KY)
Cole	Gutierrez	Linder
Collins	Gutknecht	LoBiondo
Combest	Hall	Lofgren
Cooper	Harman	Lowe
Costello	Harris	Lucas (KY)
Cox	Hart	Lucas (OK)

Lynch	Payne	Simpson
Majette	Pearce	Skelton
Maloney	Pelosi	Slaughter
Manzullo	Pence	Smith (MI)
Markey	Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Marshall	Peterson (PA)	Smith (WA)
Matheson	Petri	Snyder
Matsui	Pitts	Solis
McCarthy (MO)	Platts	Souder
McCarthy (NY)	Pombo	Spratt
McCollum	Pomeroy	Stearns
McCotter	Porter	Stenholm
McCrery	Portman	Strickland
McDermott	Price (NC)	Stupak
McGovern	Pryce (OH)	Sweeney
McHugh	Putnam	Tancredo
McInnis	Quinn	Tanner
McIntyre	Radanovich	Tauscher
McKeon	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Rangel	Taylor (NC)
Meehan	Regula	Terry
Meek (FL)	Rehberg	Thomas
Meeks (NY)	Renzi	Thompson (CA)
Menendez	Reynolds	Thompson (MS)
Mica	Rodriguez	Thornberry
Michaud	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
Millender-	Rogers (KY)	Tierney
McDonald	Rogers (MI)	Toomey
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Towns
Miller (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner (OH)
Miller, Gary	Ross	Turner (TX)
Miller, George	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Moore	Royce	Upton
Moran (KS)	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Moran (VA)	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Murphy	Ryan (WI)	Visclosky
Murtha	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Musgrave	Sabo	Walden (OR)
Myrick	Sanchez, Linda	Walsh
Nadler	T.	Wamp
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Neal (MA)	Sanders	Watson
Nethercutt	Sandlin	Watt
Ney	Saxton	Waxman
Northup	Schakowsky	Weiner
Norwood	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Nunes	Schrock	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Scott (GA)	Weller
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Wexler
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Oliver	Serrano	Wicker
Ortiz	Sessions	Wilson (NM)
Osborne	Shadegg	Wilson (SC)
Ose	Shaw	Wolf
Otter	Shays	Woolsey
Owens	Sherman	Wynn
Oxley	Sherwood	Young (AK)
Pallone	Shimkus	Young (FL)
Pascrell	Shuster	
Pastor	Simmons	

NAYS—2

Paul Rahall

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Conyers Stark Wu

NOT VOTING—18

Blunt	Gallegly	Reyes
Cannon	Gephardt	Rush
Cubin	Hulshof	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Lipinski	Sullivan
Doggett	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Ferguson	Pickering	Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). The Chair reminds Members there is less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1905

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 92ND BIRTHDAY OF RONALD REAGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 19.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 19, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, answered “present” 11, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Coble	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Cole	Goode
Aderholt	Collins	Goodlatte
Akin	Combest	Gordon
Alexander	Cooper	Goss
Allen	Costello	Granger
Andrews	Cox	Graves
Baca	Cramer	Green (TX)
Bachus	Crane	Green (WI)
Baird	Crenshaw	Greenwood
Baker	Crowley	Grijalva
Baldwin	Culberson	Gutierrez
Ballance	Cummings	Gutknecht
Ballenger	Cunningham	Hall
Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Harman
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Harris
Barton (TX)	Davis (FL)	Hart
Bass	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Beauprez	Davis (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Becerra	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayes
Bell	Davis, Tom	Hayworth
Bereuter	DeFazio	Hefley
Berkley	DeGette	Hensarling
Berman	Delahunt	Herger
Berry	DeLauro	Hill
Biggart	DeLay	Hinojosa
Bilirakis	DeMint	Hobson
Bishop (GA)	Deutsch	Hoefel
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hoekstra
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Holden
Blackburn	Dicks	Holt
Blumenauer	Dingell	Honda
Boehlert	Doggett	Hooley (OR)
Boehner	Dooley (CA)	Hostettler
Bonilla	Doolittle	Houghton
Bonner	Doyle	Hoyer
Bono	Dreier	Hunter
Boozman	Duncan	Hyde
Boswell	Dunn	Inslee
Boucher	Edwards	Isakson
Boyd	Ehlers	Israel
Bradley (NH)	Emanuel	Issa
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Istook
Brady (TX)	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Brown (OH)	English	Jackson-Lee
Brown (SC)	Eshoo	(TX)
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Janklow
Ginny	Evans	Jefferson
Burgess	Everett	Jenkins
Burns	Farr	John
Burr	Fattah	Johnson (CT)
Burton (IN)	Feeney	Johnson (IL)
Buyer	Filner	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Flake	Jones (NC)
Camp	Fletcher	Jones (OH)
Cantor	Foley	Kanjorski
Capito	Forbes	Kaptur
Capps	Ford	Keller
Capuano	Fossella	Kelly
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Kennedy (MN)
Cardoza	Franks (AZ)	Kennedy (RI)
Carson (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Carson (OK)	Frost	Kind
Carter	Gallegly	King (IA)
Case	Garrett (NJ)	King (NY)
Castle	Gerlach	Kingston
Chabot	Gibbons	Kirk
Chocola	Gilchrest	Klecza
Clay	Gillmor	Kline
Clyburn	Gingrey	Knollenberg

Kolbe	Oberstar	Shadegg
Kucinich	Obey	Shaw
LaHood	Olver	Shays
Lampson	Ortiz	Sherman
Langevin	Osborne	Sherwood
Larsen (WA)	Ose	Shinkus
Larson (CT)	Otter	Shuster
Latham	Owens	Simmons
LaTourette	Oxley	Simpson
Leach	Pallone	Skelton
Levin	Pascarell	Slaughter
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Smith (MI)
Lewis (GA)	Paul	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (KY)	Payne	Smith (WA)
Linder	Pearce	Snyder
Lipinski	Pelosi	Solis
LoBiondo	Pence	Souder
Lofgren	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
Lowe	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Lucas (KY)	Petri	Stenholm
Lucas (OK)	Pickering	Strickland
Lynch	Pitts	Stupak
Majette	Platts	Sullivan
Maloney	Pombo	Sweeney
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Tancred
Markey	Porter	Tanner
Marshall	Portman	Tauscher
Matheson	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Matsui	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (NC)
McCarthy (MO)	Putnam	Terry
McCarthy (NY)	Quinn	Thomas
McCollum	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCotter	Ramstad	Thompson (MS)
McCrery	Rangel	Thornberry
McGovern	Regula	Tiahrt
McHugh	Rehberg	Tierney
McInnis	Renzi	Toomey
McIntyre	Reynolds	Turner (OH)
McKeon	Rodriguez	Turner (TX)
McNulty	Rogers (AL)	Udall (CO)
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Udall (NM)
Meek (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Meeks (NY)	Rohrabacher	Van Hollen
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Velazquez
Mica	Ross	Visclosky
Millender-	Rothman	Vitter
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Walden (OR)
Miller (MI)	Royce	Walsh
Miller (NC)	Ruppersberger	Wamp
Miller, Gary	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Miller, George	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Mollohan	Ryan (KS)	Waxman
Moore	Sabo	Weiner
Moran (KS)	Sanchez, Linda	Weldon (FL)
Moran (VA)	T.	Weldon (PA)
Murphy	Sanchez, Loretta	Weller
Murtha	Sanders	Wexler
Musgrave	Sandlin	Whitfield
Myrick	Saxton	Wicker
Napolitano	Schakowsky	Wilson (NM)
Neal (MA)	Schiff	Wilson (SC)
Nethercutt	Schrock	Wolf
Ney	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Northup	Scott (VA)	Wynn
Norwood	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Nunes	Serrano	Young (FL)
Nussle	Sessions	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11

Brown, Corrine	Kilpatrick	Towns
Conyers	Lee	Watson
Hinche	McDermott	Wu
Johnson, E. B.	Stark	

NOT VOTING—17

Blunt	Hulshof	Reyes
Cannon	Lantos	Rush
Cubin	Michaud	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Ferguson	Nadler	Tiberi
Gephardt	Radanovich	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair reminds Members there is less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1912

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, on H. Res. 61, I intended to vote "yea." I voted "present" by mistake, thinking it was the Ronald Reagan resolution, H.J. Res. 19, which was voted on immediately after the vote on H. Res. 61. To restate the record, I proceeded, after voting on H. Res. 61, to vote "present" on H.J. Res. 19, the joint resolution commending former President Reagan.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 23, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 63), and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 63

Resolved, That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Budget: Mr. Shays to rank after Mr. Nussle; and Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida to rank after Mr. Hensarling.

Education and the Workforce: Mr. Gingrey. Science: Mr. Gilchrest to rank after Mrs. Biggert; and Mr. Feeney to rank after Mr. Bonner.

Small Business: Mr. Chocola. Standards of Official Conduct: Mr. Hastings of Washington; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Hulshof; and Mr. LaTourette.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1915

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DEALING WITH THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, these are serious times. The Nation is on Orange Alert. All Americans are urged to buy duct tape, plastic sheeting and other things to create safe havens in their home. That is because of the threat of al Qaeda and terrorist networks. The head of al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden—remember him, wanted dead or alive?—the President has not mentioned his name in about 12 months, because he is still very much alive and leading and

reorganizing and reenergizing his network, which is the greatest threat to the physical security of the United States.

He did a 1-hour broadcast, or rant, against the United States, which was broadcast on al-Jazeera today. He is still alive and well, probably under the protection of the security services in a part of Pakistan where both the Taliban and al Qaeda have free rein and are organizing further attacks against Afghanistan, which is not yet stabilized, and against the United States and its allies around the world and probably against the Government of Pakistan. Should they be able to take over Pakistan, they would instantly possess nuclear weapons. It sounds like a problem.

But we have others. We have Kim Jong Il, a psychopathic dictator running North Korea, who has threatened to launch a preemptive nuclear strike against the United States of America, and he has nuclear weapons and he has intermediate-range missiles. He can hit Japan and other countries; he has not yet the capability of hitting the United States. But he also gets 25 percent of his income for his country by selling weapons of mass destruction and sophisticated technology to terrorists. He seems like a pretty big threat.

So what is the response of the Bush administration? Attack Saddam Hussein, who does not possess nuclear weapons. He has a few hidden, short-range missiles that do not work very well. Yes, he is probably hiding some anthrax or some chemical weapons. He hid them before. We sent in the inspectors and we persisted over 4½ years and, guess what, we found them and we destroyed them, without the destabilization of that entire region after the first war in the Gulf.

We could do that again. We could have enhanced inspections. We could move forward and begin to deal with these other threats, these very real threats.

The administration keeps telling us blithely, just sort of in offhand comments, Don't worry, we can multitask. We can take care of Kim Jong Il and his nuclear weapons through diplomacy somehow. But not the Middle East. And, yeah, we'll get around to Osama bin Laden, dead or alive, later. Yeah, it's serious, he's in Pakistan, he's making broadcasts, he's organizing and they are the greatest threat to the United States of America and its citizens, but we don't have time for them right now because we want to go after this little tin pot dictator who's terrorizing his own people and is surrounded in a box in his country in the Middle East with inspectors on the ground and about to have planes flying overhead. Plus the U.S., of course, controls a significant amount of his airspace now. But the response of the administration is, "That's our highest priority."

I fear that this administration has misplaced priorities that are not going to provide the protection that our

country warrants, and I know that their priorities are totally misplaced in terms of the economy. I just met yesterday with a group of dislocated workers in my district who are getting retrained, trying desperately to find work. We have the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, yet the economists and other pundits tell us, Well, the clouds of war, the high oil prices and all that, you can't expect the economy to recover right now.

How about if we chose a different path and revitalized our economy and invested there and put people back to work, that is the greatest threat to the security of the people in my district, and then dealt with the real threats to our security, like Osama bin Laden, dead or alive? It is about time the President delivered on that promise. It has been almost 2 years.

And how about Kim Jong Il and his nuclear weapons?

Let us get to the real threats. Let us deal reasonably with the problems in the Middle East, but let us not exaggerate them and say that he is the greatest threat because our intelligence services and all the foreign intelligence services tell us that is just not true. We have got him contained, we have got him where we want him and we can take the time to find and disarm his weapons.

IN HONOR OF THE BIRTHDAY OF MRS. HELEN GINGREY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take my time this evening to address the House regarding a very important person, someone who has meant so much to me and without whom undoubtedly I would not be here today. Mrs. Helen Gingrey turned 85 last Saturday, February 8, 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and Members of the House of Representatives will want to join me tonight in saying, Happy Birthday, Mom.

It is important in this day and age for children to grow up in a strong family environment like the one my parents provided for me. I would hope that as I embark on my tenure here, representing the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, that my colleagues and I would always keep an eye on how our actions will affect the American families who are struggling to stay together and to make ends meet.

My mother has had a great life and has been a blessing to both her community and to her family. She is the daughter of Irish and Scotch immigrants. She was born in New York City in 1918. She grew up in Astoria of the Queens Borough. She married my dad when she was 19 years old. He was a native of South Carolina and had come to New York at age 16 in near poverty with little means of support. Shortly after their marriage, they moved back

to South Carolina, to Edgefield, the birthplace of Senator Strom Thurmond, and began to raise their family, me and my two brothers.

My dad died 22 years ago. My mom and dad were high school graduates who worked hard in one small business after another. They never had the opportunity to go to college, but they struggled to make sure that their three sons; my brother Bill, my brother James and myself, attended college. The ideals my parents instilled in us are the ones of hard work, good education, personal responsibility, respect for others, love of family and love of country. These are not only good principles for rearing children, but also good guidelines for the initiatives we will work on here in this 108th Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to use the example and the principles of Mrs. Helen Gingrey and all loving mothers like her to set an agenda that will work to strengthen and support the most vital component of our great Nation, the American family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS 108TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for publication in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—COMMITTEE RULES

RESOLVED, That the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in the One Hundred Seventh Congress, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, shall be and are hereby adopted as the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations in the One Hundred Eighth Congress with the following amendment to the standing rules as provided below:

In Section 7, add at the end the following new paragraph:

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and any of its subcommittees may—

(1) postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment;

(2) resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice.

When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

The foregoing resolution adopts the following rules:

SEC. 1: POWER TO SIT AND ACT

For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of

the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized:

(a) To sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(b) To require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, reports, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. The Chairman, or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(c) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees under subsection 1 (b) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subsection 1 (b) may be delegated to the Chairman pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(d) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or its subcommittees may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

SEC. 2: SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall establish the number of subcommittees and shall determine the jurisdiction of each subcommittee.

(b) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee all matters referred to it.

(c) All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks unless, by majority vote of the Majority Members of the full Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee.

(d) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of Majority to Minority Members for each subcommittee. The Chairman is authorized to negotiate that ratio with the Minority; Provided, however, That party representation in each subcommittee, including ex-officio members, shall be no less favorable to the Majority than the ratio for the full Committee.

(e) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are authorized to sit as a member of all subcommittees and to participate, including voting, in all its work.

SEC. 3: STAFFING

(a) Committee Staff—The Chairman is authorized to appoint the staff of the Committee, and make adjustments in the job titles and compensation thereof subject to the maximum rates and conditions established in Clause 9(c) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. In addition, he is authorized, in his discretion, to arrange for their specialized training. The Chairman is also authorized to employ additional personnel as necessary.

(b) Assistants to Members—Each of the top twenty-one senior majority and minority Members of the full Committee may select and designate one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of that Member. Such staff members shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the Member, not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 9(c) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives; Provided, That Members designating staff members under this subsection must specifically certify by

letter to the Chairman that the employees are needed and will be utilized for Committee work.

SEC. 4: COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meeting Day.—The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the first Wednesday of each month while the House is in session, unless the Committee has met within the past 30 days or the Chairman considers a specific meeting unnecessary in the light of the requirements of the Committee business schedule.

(b) Additional and Special Meetings:

(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution ending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(2) If at least three Committee Members desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those Members may file in the Committee Offices a written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Upon the filing of the request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman.

(3) If within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the Committee Offices their written notice that a special meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour of such meeting, and the measure or matter to be considered. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour.

(4) Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Committee Clerk shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at the special meeting.

(c) Vice Chairman To Preside in Absence of Chairman, member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee thereof designated by the Chairman of the full Committee shall be vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside at any meeting during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the Committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(d) Business Meetings:

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or its subcommittees, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed.

(2) No person other than Committee Members and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed.

(e) Committee Records:

(1) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each roll call vote shall be available for inspection by the public during regular business hours in the Committee Offices. The information made available for public inspection

shall include a description of the amendment, motion, or other proposition, and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(2) All hearings, records, data, charts, and files of the Committee shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chairman of the Committee. Such records shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

(3) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House, except that the Committee authorizes use of any record to which Clause 3(b)(4) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House would otherwise apply after such record has been in existence for 20 years. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to Clause 3(b)(3) or Clause 4(b) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination upon the written request of any Member of the Committee.

SEC. 5: COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

21(a) Overall Budget Hearings—Overall budget hearings by the Committee, including the hearing required by Section 242(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and Clause 4(a)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be conducted in open session except when the Committee in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that the testimony to be taken at that hearing on that day may be related to a matter of national security; except that the Committee may be the same procedure close one subsequent day of hearing. A transcript of all such hearings shall be printed and a copy furnished to each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

(b) Other Hearings:

(1) All other hearings conducted by the Committee or its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee in open session and with a majority present determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or Rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present at a hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its subcommittees, there being in attendance the number required under Section 5(c) of these Rules to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, (1) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate Clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or (2) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in Clause 2(k)(5) of such Rule. No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or its subcommittees unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or any of its subcommittees, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public; *Provided, however,* That the Committee or its subcommittees may by the

same procedure vote to close five subsequent days of hearings.

(2) Subcommittee chairmen shall coordinate the development of schedules for meetings or hearings after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

(3) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or any of its subcommittees as the case may be, insofar as is practicable, shall file in advance of such appearance, a written statement of the proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary, except that this provision shall not apply to any witness appearing before the Committee in the overall budget hearings.

(4) Each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity before the Committee, or any of its subcommittees as the case may be, shall to the greatest extent practicable, submit a written statement including a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(c) Quorum for Taking Testimony—The number of Members of the Committee which shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence in any hearing of the Committee shall be two.

(d) Calling and Interrogation of Witnesses:

(1) The Minority Members of the Committee or its subcommittees shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, by a majority of them before completion of any hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to the matter under consideration during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(2) The Committee and its subcommittees shall observe the five-minute rule during the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each Member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(e) Broadcasting and Photographing of Committee Meetings and Hearings—Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the full Committee or any of its subcommittees is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, as provided in Clause (4)(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Neither the full Committee Chairman or Subcommittee Chairman shall limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium.

(f) Subcommittee Meetings—No subcommittee shall sit while the House is reading an appropriation measure for amendment under the five-minute rule or while the Committee is in session.

(g) Public Notice of Committee Hearings—The Chairman of the Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee or subcommittee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the Committee or respective subcommittee, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman or subcommittee chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this subparagraph shall be promptly

published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

SEC. 6: PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) Prompt Reporting Requirement:

(1) It shall be the duty of the Chairman to report, or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill or resolution approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, a report on a bill or resolution which the Committee has approved shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days in which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Committee Clerk a written request, signed by a majority of Committee Members, for the reporting of such bill or resolution. Upon the filing of any such request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman immediately of the filing of the request. This subsection does not apply to the reporting of a regular appropriation bill or to the reporting of a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(b) Presence of Committee Majority—No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(c) Roll Call Votes—With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any measure of matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(d) Compliance With Congressional Budget Act—A Committee report on a bill or resolution which has been approved by the Committee shall include the statement required by Section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority.

(e) Constitutional Authority Statement—Each report of the committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

(f) Changes in Existing Law—Each Committee report on a general appropriation bill shall contain a concise statement describing fully the effect of any provision of the bill which directly or indirectly changes the application of existing law.

(g) Rescissions and Transfers—Each bill or resolution reported by the Committee shall include separate headings for rescissions and transfers of unexpended balances with all proposed rescissions and transfers listed therein. The report of the Committee accompanying such a bill or resolution shall include a separate section with respect to such rescissions or transfers.

(h) Listing of Unauthorized Appropriations—Each Committee report on a general appropriations bill shall contain a list of all appropriations contained in the bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law (except for classified intelligence or national security programs, projects, or activities) along with a statement of the last year for which such expenditures were authorized, the level of expenditures authorized for that year, the actual level of expenditures for that year, and the level of appropriations in the bill for such expenditures.

(i) Supplemental or Minority Views:

(1) If, at the time the Committee approves any measure or matter, any Committee

Member gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, the Member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views in writing and signed by the Member, with the Clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed shall be included in and shall be a part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(2) The Committee report on that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(i) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(ii) shall have on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views are included as part of the report.

(3) Subsection (i)(1) of this section, above, does not preclude—

(i) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by such subsection; or

(ii) the filing by the committee of a supplemental report on a measure or matter which may be required for correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that measure or matter.

(4) If, at the time a subcommittee approves any measure or matter for recommendation to the full Committee, any Member of that subcommittee who gives notice of intention to offer supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be entitled, insofar as is practicable and in accordance with the printing requirements as determined by the subcommittee, to include such views in the Committee Print with respect to that measure or matter.

(j) Availability of Reports—A copy of each bill, resolution, or report shall be made available to each Member of the Committee at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in advance of the date on which the Committee is to consider each bill, resolution, or report; Provided, That this subsection may be waived by agreement between the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee.

(k) Performance Goals and Objectives—Each Committee report shall contain a statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding.

SEC. 7: VOTING

(a) No vote by any Member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(b) The vote on any question before the Committee shall be taken by the yeas and nays on the demand of one-fifth of the Members present.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and any of its subcommittees may—

(1) postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment;

(2) resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

SEC. 8: STUDIES AND EXAMINATIONS

The following procedure shall be applicable with respect to the conduct of studies and

examinations of the organization and operation of Executive Agencies under authority contained in Section 202 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in Clause (3)(a) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) The Chairman is authorized to appoint such staff and, in his discretion, arrange for the procurement of temporary services of consultants, as from time to time may be required.

(b) Studies and examinations will be initiated upon the written request of a subcommittee which shall be reasonably specific and definite in character, and shall be initiated only by a majority vote of the subcommittee, with the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member thereof participating as part of such majority vote. When so initiated such request shall be filed with the Clerk of the Committee for submission to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member and their approval shall be required to make the same effective. Notwithstanding any action taken on such request by the chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, a request may be approved by a majority of the Committee.

(c) Any request approved as provided under subsection (b) shall be immediately turned over to the staff appointed for action.

(d) Any information obtained by such staff shall be reported to the chairman of the subcommittee requesting such study and examination and to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, shall be made available to the members of the subcommittee concerned, and shall not be released for publication until the subcommittee so determines.

(e) Any hearings or investigations which may be desired, aside from the regular hearings on appropriation items, when approved by the Committee, shall be conducted by the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the matter.

SEC. 9: OFFICIAL TRAVEL

(a) The chairman of a subcommittee shall approve requests for travel by subcommittee members and staff for official business within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee. The ranking minority member of a subcommittee shall concur in such travel requests by minority members of that subcommittee and the Ranking Minority Member shall concur in such travel requests for Minority Members of the Committee. Requests in writing covering the purpose, itinerary, and dates of proposed travel shall be submitted for final approval to the Chairman. Specific approval shall be required for each and every trip.

(b) The Chairman is authorized during the recess of the Congress to approve travel authorizations for Committee Members and staff, including travel outside the United States.

(c) As soon as practicable, the Chairman shall direct the head of each Government agency concerned not to honor requests of subcommittee, individual Members, or staff for travel, the direct or indirect expenses of which are to be defrayed from an executive appropriation, except upon request from the Chairman.

(d) In accordance with Clause 8 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and Section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, local currencies owned by the United States shall be available to Committee Members and staff engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories, or possessions. No Committee Member or staff member shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law.

(e) Travel Reports:

(1) Members or staff shall make a report to the Chairman on their travel, covering the purpose, results, itinerary, expenses, and other pertinent comments.

(2) With respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions, the report shall include: (1) an itemized list showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose; and (2) a summary in these categories of the total foreign currencies and/or appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports on foreign travel shall be filed with the Chairman no later than sixty days following completion of the travel for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law, and shall be open for public inspection.

(3) Each Member or employee performing such travel shall be solely responsible for supporting the amounts reported by the Member or employee.

(4) No report or statement as to any trip shall be publicized making any recommendations in behalf of the Committee without the authorization of a majority of the Committee.

(f) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Committee shall be governed by applicable laws or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, and as promulgated from time to time by the Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, 108TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 108th Congress for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
108TH CONGRESS—ADOPTED FEBRUARY 4, 2003

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

Rule 1—Applicability of House Rules

Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege.

MEETINGS

Rule 2—Regular meetings

(a) The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session.

(b) The Chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when the Chairman determines there is no business to be considered by the committee. The Chairman shall

give written notice to that effect to each member of the committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

(c) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

Rule 3—Additional and special meetings

(a) The Chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the committee as the Chairman considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(c).

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chairman shall provide written notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least three days in advance when Congress is not in session.

Rule 4—Open business meetings

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(1).

(b) No person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the committee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

Rule 5—Quorums

A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

Rule 6—Recognition

Any member, when recognized by the Chairman, may address the committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the committee. The time of such member shall be limited to five minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

Rule 7—Consideration of business

Measures or matters may be placed before the committee, for its consideration, by the Chairman or by a majority vote of the members of the committee, a quorum being present.

Rule 8—Availability of legislation

The committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all committee members at least four hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for committee consideration). The provision of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

Rule 9—Procedure for consideration of budget resolution

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other

appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

Rule 10—Roll call votes

A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

HEARINGS

Rule 11—Announcement of hearings

The Chairman shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least 1 week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

Rule 12—Open hearings

(a) Each hearing conducted by the committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The committee or task forces may be the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes of House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(2), the task forces of the committee are considered to be subcommittees.

Rule 13—Quorums

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 14—Questioning witnesses

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the five-minute rule unless the committee adopts a motion pursuant to House Rule XI clause 2(j).

(b) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member may be recognized first, after which members may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing. Among the members present at the time the hearing is called to order, seniority shall be recognized. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

Rule 15—Subpoenas and oaths

(a) In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(m) subpoenas authorized by a majority of the committee may be issued over the

signature of the Chairman or of any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member.

(b) The Chairman, or any member of the committee designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Rule 16—Witnesses' statements

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Rule 17—Committee prints

All committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the committee.

Rule 18—Committee publications on the Internet

To the maximum extent feasible, the committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

Rule 19—Committee staff

(a) Subject to approval by the committee, and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs a, b, and c, staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

Rule 20—Staff supervision

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House rule X, clause ((c)) and job titles, and, at his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

Rule 21—Preparation and maintenance of committee records

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on

any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) Members of the committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chairman may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impeded the committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chairman decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

Rule 22—Access to committee records

(a)(1) The Chairman shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to committee records (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(e)).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the committee members. Such information shall be kept in the committee safe, and shall be available to members in the committee office.

(b) The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the committee.

OVERSIGHT

Rule 23—General oversight

(a) The committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of Rule X, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of House Rule X.

REPORTS

Rule 24—Availability before filing

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the committee shall be available to all committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pur-

suant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or by a majority vote of the committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chairman or with a majority vote by the committee.

Rule 25—Report on the budget resolution

The report of the committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

Rule 26—Parliamentarian's Status Report and Section 302 Status Report

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The committee authorizes the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The committee authorizes the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

Rule 27—Activity report

After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chair of the committee may file any time with the Clerk the committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

Rule 28—Broadcasting of meetings and hearings

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in House Rule XI, clause 4.

(b) Whenever any committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or by any

of such methods of coverage, in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4.

Rule 29—Appointment of conferees

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chairman subject to the approval of the majority party members of the committee.

(b) The Chairman shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the committee.

Rule 30—Waivers

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chairman may, if practical, consult with the committee members on whether the Chairman should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

UPDATE ON CUBA'S PROJECT VARELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in May of 2002, over 11,000 Cuban citizens took a courageous stand and petitioned the Cuban National Assembly to hold a nationwide referendum vote on guarantees of human rights and civil liberties. Named for the 19th century priest and Cuban independence hero, Padre Felix Varela, the Varela Project was the first-ever peaceful challenge to Castro's four-decade-long control of the island.

With its 11,000-plus signatures, the project qualified under article 88 of the Cuban constitution, which states that if the Cuban National Assembly receives the verified signatures of 10,000 legal voters, a referendum on the issue should be scheduled. Varela was the first-ever attempt to try and work within the system to bring about change in Cuba.

Not surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, instead of allowing his parliament to consider Project Varela, Fidel Castro introduced his own so-called "referendum" that would stop future consideration of Project Varela and any other democratic reform efforts. Then, late last month, a Cuban legislative committee threw out the project, officially putting an end to Varela's hopes for peaceful reform.

Despite this, Mr. Speaker, the project is far from over. The true aim of the project was not to win political support, but to bring hope to the Cuban people that peaceable change is possible. Oswaldo Paya and Varela's other organizers have worked to educate the Cuban people citizen by citizen and bring the struggles of the Cuban people to the world stage. It is my hope that many of my colleagues will support this project and it will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with one final note. In response to

questions regarding the future of the Varela project, Varela's organizer Oswaldo Paya said only, "Our Varela Project continues. It's a campaign to inform the Cuban people and we will continue until all Cubans achieve their rights." I want to commend those involved in Project Varela, that they continue for a long time.

SUPPORTING NOMINATION OF MIGUEL ESTRADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, like many Members of this Chamber, I have often spoken with fond affection of my grandfather, a gentleman who came to the United States as an immigrant from Belgium. He did not speak the language. He spoke Flemish. In spite of his limitations, not only did he not speak English, he basically had no formal education, he embraced this country and he embraced what we all call the American dream. I am very, very grateful to that immigrant from Belgium, my grandfather, for clinging to that dream, fostering that dream, instilling that dream in me and many other of my family members and people he came in contact with over his extended life.

□ 1930

It is what America is all about. I rise tonight to talk about someone who instills those same values, those same characteristics, that same American dream: Mr. Miguel Estrada.

Mr. Estrada came to the United States of America as a teenager from Honduras. He did not speak our language. In spite of that, shortly thereafter Mr. Estrada found himself graduating Phi Beta Kappa from Columbia College in New York, later from Harvard Law School where he was also editor of the Harvard Law Review. As this Chamber knows full well, Mr. Estrada has been nominated to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Mr. Estrada is currently serving as a partner in a prestigious Washington, D.C. law firm. He is very accomplished. He has formerly served as assistant United States Solicitor General during the Bush and Clinton administrations from 1992 to 1997, assistant U.S. Attorney and deputy chief of the appellate section for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of the State of New York. Mr. Estrada argued 15 cases before the United States Supreme Court, both criminal and civil. He tried ten cases as a prosecutor and argued seven cases before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the second circuit as assistant U.S. Attorney, again for the Southern District of the State of New York. Mr. Estrada's credentials and achievement as a jurist are almost unprecedented, certainly well qualified for the Federal bench.

I would like to cite for the record what others are saying about Mr. Estrada. The American Bar Association rates Estrada as "well qualified." Ron Klain, former counsel to Vice President Gore had this to say: "I have no doubt that on the bench Miguel will faithfully apply the precedence of his court and the Supreme Court without regard, without regard," without regard, "to his personal views or his political perspectives. His belief in the rule of law, in a limited judiciary, and in the separation of powers is too strong for him to act otherwise."

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, here is what Raphael Santiago, national president of the Hispanic National Bar Association had to say: "Mr. Estrada's distinguished and impressive career illustrates the promise and opportunity that America offers to all immigrants, especially Hispanic immigrants . . . Mr. Estrada's confirmation will break new ground for Hispanics in the judiciary. The time has come to move on Mr. Estrada's nomination."

Mr. Speaker, I second those comments and look forward to the day that Miguel Estrada is a member of the Federal bench of the U.S. Court of Appeals representing the District of Columbia.

SUPPORTING THE NOMINATION OF MIGUEL ESTRADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I also stand to support the nomination of Mr. Miguel Estrada. We just heard his incredible qualifications as a lawyer, a person who has lived the American dream, who came to this country as a teenager barely speaking a word of English but through his work, his hard work, his dedication, bettered himself to become a highly respected attorney in society.

Mr. Speaker, some of those now objecting to his confirmation have not been able to find one good reason in over a year that this process has taken place, one good reason why Mr. Estrada should not be on the bench, and yet we have heard a number of discussions d'jour about why Mr. Estrada should not be there. I want to mention some of those, Mr. Speaker, that I think are rather, frankly, amusing if I may say. Some have actually said that Miguel Estrada has never served as a judge before; therefore, he is not qualified to hold this position in this prestigious court. But, Mr. Speaker, five out of the eight judges in that same court where Mr. Estrada has been nominated by this President also never had judicial experience in the past. Why was it okay for them to not have that experience and why is it not okay for this Hispanic brilliant attorney, why does he have to have experience that the other five did not have, Mr. Speaker? I do not know. It begs the question.

Mr. Speaker, some people that I admire and care for greatly who were born in the United States of Hispanic origin like I was have actually said publicly that one of the reasons that Mr. Estrada should not be a judge is because he is not Hispanic enough or "he is Hispanic by name only." Some of the people who are saying that, again like I am were born here in the United States and frankly are just not all that fluent in Spanish, and they say that Mr. Estrada, who got here when he was 17 years old, barely speaking English, is not Hispanic enough, is Hispanic by name only? Mr. Speaker, I find that to be frankly offensive, personally offensive. I have no problem that people would object if they find something objectionable in Mr. Estrada's record, but they have been able to find nothing, not one iota of evidence, nothing that should disqualify this young brilliant attorney, Mr. Speaker.

I support Mr. Estrada because it would be a wonderful thing for the country. It would be a wonderful thing for Hispanics. It would be a wonderful thing for diversity. A vote for Mr. Estrada is a vote for diversity. And, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can all united support the nomination of this brilliant, young, talented Hispanic. He deserves it, the people of the United States deserve it, and our court system clearly also deserves to have Miguel Estrada.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members that it is not in order to urge the Senate to take a particular action with regard to a presidential nomination.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE 108TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. BOEHNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules for the 108th Congress for the Committee on Education and the Workforce for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE FOR THE 108TH CONGRESS

RULE 1. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, & SPECIAL MEETINGS: VICE-CHAIRMAN

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the second Wednesday of each month at 9:30 a.m., while the House is in session. When the Chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, he will give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect; and no committee meeting shall be held on that day.

(b) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the staff director of the committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the staff director of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) All legislative meetings of the committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage. No business meeting of the committee, other than regularly scheduled meetings, may be held without each member being given reasonable notice. Such meeting shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the vice-chairman, or the Chairman's designee.

(e) The Chairman of the committee or of a subcommittee, as appropriate, shall preside at meetings or hearings, or, in the absence of the chairman, the vice-chairman, or the Chairman's designee shall preside.

RULE 2. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) Subject to clauses (b) and (c), Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The questioning of witnesses in both committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority party in order of the member's appearance at the hearing. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority party members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to place the members of the majority party in a disadvantageous position.

(b) The Chairman may permit a specified number of members to question a witness for longer than five minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this clause shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(c) The Chairman may permit committee staff for the majority and the minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this clause

shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

RULE 3. RECORDS & ROLLCALLS

(a) Written records shall be kept of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee or subcommittee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee or subcommittee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member.

(b) In accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, any official permanent record of the committee (including any record of a legislative, oversight, or other activity of the committee or any subcommittee) shall be made available for public use if such record has been in existence for 30 years, except that—

(1) any record that the committee (or a subcommittee) makes available for public use before such record is delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be made available immediately, including any record described in subsection (a) of this Rule;

(2) any investigative record that contains personal data relating to a specific living individual (the disclosure of which would be an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy), any administrative record with respect to personnel, and any record with respect to a hearing closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be available if such record has been in existence for 50 years; or

(3) except as otherwise provided by order of the House, any record of the committee for which a time, schedule, or condition for availability is specified by order of the committee (entered during the Congress in which the record is made or acquired by the committee) shall be made available in accordance with the order of the committee.

(c) The official permanent records of the committee include noncurrent records of the committee (including subcommittees) delivered by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the Archivist of the United States for preservation at the National Archives and Records Administration, which are the property of and remain subject to the rules and orders of the House of Representatives.

(d)(1) Any order of the committee with respect to any matter described in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be adopted only if the notice requirements of committee Rule 18(c) have been met, a quorum consisting of a majority of the members of the committee is present at the time of the vote, and a majority of those present and voting approve the adoption of the order, which shall be submitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, together with any accompanying report.

(2) This subsection applies to any order of the committee which—

(A) provides for the non-availability of any record subject to subsection (b) of this rule for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable; or

(B) is subsequent to, and constitutes a later order under clause 4(b) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives,

regarding a determination of the Clerk of the House of Representatives with respect to authorizing the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or

(C) specifies a time, schedule, or condition for availability pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of this Rule.

RULE 4. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES & JURISDICTION

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees. In addition to the conducting oversight in the area of their respective jurisdictions as required in clause 2 of House Rule X, each subcommittee shall have the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Education Reform.—Education from preschool through the high school level including, but not limited to, elementary and secondary education generally, vocational education, preschool programs including the Head Start Act, school lunch and child nutrition, and overseas dependent schools; special education programs including, but not limited to, alcohol and drug abuse, education of the disabled, migrant and agricultural labor education and homeless education; educational research and improvement, including the Office of Educational Research and Improvement; poverty programs, including the Community Services Block Grant Act and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP).

Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness.—Education and training beyond the high school level including, but not limited to higher education generally, including postsecondary student assistance and employment services, Title IV of the Higher Education Act; training and apprenticeship including the Workforce Investment Act, displaced homemakers, adult basic education (family literacy), rehabilitation, professional development, and training programs from immigration funding; pre-service and in-service teacher training, including Title II of the elementary and Secondary Education Act and Title II of the Higher Education Act; Title III and V of the Higher Education Act; Title I of the Higher Education Act as it relates to Titles II, III, IV, and V; science and technology programs; affirmative action in higher education; all welfare reform programs including, work incentive programs, welfare-to-work requirements, and childcare services, including the Childcare Development Block Grant; Native American Programs Act, Robert A. Taft Institute, and Institute for Peace.

Subcommittee on Select Education.—Programs and services for the care and treatment of certain at risk youth, including the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act; all matters dealing with child abuse and domestic violence, including the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and child adoption; all matters dealing with programs and services for the elderly, including nutrition programs and the Older Americans Act; environmental education; all domestic volunteer programs; School to Work Opportunities Act; library services and construction, and programs related to the arts and humanities, museum services, and arts and artifacts indemnity; Titles VI and VII, Title I as it relates to those Titles, and oversight of Title III and V of the Higher Education Act; and fiscal auditing of the Department of Education organization.

Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.—Wages and hours of labor including, but not limited to, Davis-Bacon Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Fair Labor Standards Act (in-

cluding child labor), workers' compensation generally, Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, Federal Employees' Compensation Act, Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, Service Contract Act, Family and Medical Leave Act, Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, workers' health and safety including, but not limited to, occupational safety and health, mine health and safety, youth camp safety, and migrant and agricultural labor health and safety; and, in addition, oversight of compulsory union dues within the jurisdiction of another subcommittee.

Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations.—All matters dealing with relationships between employers and employees generally including, but not limited to, the National Labor Relations Act, Bureau of Labor Statistics, pension, health, and other employee benefits, including the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA); all matters related to equal employment opportunity and civil rights in employment, including affirmative action.

(b) The majority party members of the committee may provide for such temporary, ad hoc subcommittees as determined to be appropriate.

RULE 5. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman of the committee and the ranking minority party member shall be ex officio members, but not voting members, of each subcommittee to which such Chairman or ranking minority party member has not been assigned.

RULE 6. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS

To facilitate the oversight and other legislative and investigative activities of the committee, the Chairman of the committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chairman, make a temporary assignment of any member of the committee to such subcommittee for the purpose of constituting a quorum and of enabling such member to participate in any public hearing, investigation, or study by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington, DC. Any member of the committee may attend public hearings of any subcommittee and any member of the committee may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman for that purpose.

RULE 7. SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS

The method for selection of chairmen of the subcommittees shall be at the discretion of the full committee Chairman, unless a majority of the majority party members of the full committee disapprove of the action of the Chairman.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULING

Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings, wherever possible. Available dates for subcommittee meetings during the session shall be assigned by the Chairman to the subcommittees as nearly as practicable in rotation and in accordance with their workloads. As far as practicable, the Chairman shall not schedule simultaneous subcommittee markups, a subcommittee markup during a full committee markup, or any hearing during a markup.

RULE 9. SUBCOMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the committee shall be the rules of its subcommittees.

RULE 10. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The employees of the committee shall be appointed by the Chairman in consultation with subcommittee chairmen and other

majority party members of the committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

(b) The staff appointed by the minority shall have their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority party members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

RULE 11. SUPERVISION & DUTIES OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate authority as he determines appropriate. The staff appointed by the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority party members of the committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate. All committee staff shall be assigned to committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

RULE 12. HEARINGS PROCEDURE

(a) The Chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee or subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman or the subcommittee chairman, as the case may be, shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. To the extent practicable, the Chairman or the subcommittee chairman shall make public announcement of the final list of witnesses scheduled to testify at least 48 hours before the commencement of the hearing. The staff director of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) All opening statements at hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee will be made part of the permanent written record. Opening statements by members may not be presented orally, unless the Chairman of the committee or any subcommittee determines that one statement from the Chairman or a designee will be presented, in which case the ranking minority party member or a designee may also make a statement. If a witness scheduled to testify at any hearing of the Committee or any subcommittee is a constituent of a member of the committee or subcommittee, such member shall be entitled to introduce such witness at the hearing.

(c) To the extent practicable, witnesses who are to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the staff director of the committee, at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance, a written statement of their proposed testimony, together with a brief summary thereof, and shall limit their oral presentation to a summary thereof. The staff director of the committee shall promptly furnish to the staff director of the minority a copy of such testimony submitted to the committee pursuant to this rule.

(d) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority party members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at

least one day of hearing thereon. The minority party may waive this right by calling at least one witness during a committee hearing or subcommittee hearing.

RULE 13. MEETINGS—HEARINGS—QUORUMS

(a) Subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings, receive exhibits, hear witnesses, and report to the committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be agreed upon by the subcommittee. No such meetings or hearings, however, shall be held outside of Washington, DC, or during recess or adjournments of the House without the prior authorization of the committee Chairman. Where feasible and practicable, 14 days' notice will be given of such meeting or hearing.

(b) One-third of the members of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than amending committee rules, closing a meeting from the public, reporting a measure or recommendation, or in the case of the committee or a subcommittee authorizing a subpoena. For the enumerated actions, a majority of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. Any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(c) When a bill or resolution is being considered by the committee or a subcommittee, members shall provide the clerk in a timely manner a sufficient number of written copies of any amendment offered, so as to enable each member present to receive a copy thereof prior to taking action. A point of order may be made against any amendment not reduced to writing. A copy of each such amendment shall be maintained in the public records of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

(d) In the conduct of hearings of subcommittees sitting jointly, the rules otherwise applicable to all subcommittees shall likewise apply to joint subcommittee hearings for purposes of such shared consideration.

(e) No person other than a Member of Congress or Congressional staff may walk in, stand in, or be seated at the rostrum area during a meeting or hearing of the Committee or Subcommittee unless authorized by the Chairman.

RULE 14. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the full committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member prior to issuing any subpoena under such authority. To the extent practicable, the Chairman shall consult with the ranking minority member at least 24 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays. As soon as practicable after issuing any subpoena under such authority, the Chairman shall notify in writing all members of the Committee of the issuance of the subpoena.

RULE 15. REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(b) In any event, the report, described in the proviso in subsection (d) of this rule, of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the staff director of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the staff director of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the subcommittee a notice of the filing of that request.

(c) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report: "This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and the Workforce (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and therefore may not necessarily reflect the views of its members."

The minority party members of the committee or subcommittee shall have three calendar days, excluding weekends and holidays, to file, as part of the printed report, supplemental, minority, or additional views.

(d) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported. No bill or resolution or other matter reported by a subcommittee unless it has been delivered or electronically sent to all members and notice of its prior transmission has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to such consideration; a member of the Committee shall receive, upon his or her request, a paper copy of the such bill, resolution, or other matter reported. When a bill is reported from a subcommittee, such measure shall be accompanied by a section-by-section analysis; and, if the Chairman of the committee so requires (in response to a request from the ranking minority member of the committee or for other reasons), a comparison showing proposed changes in existing law.

(e) To the extent practicable, any report prepared pursuant to a committee or subcommittee study or investigation shall be available to members no later than 48 hours prior to consideration of any such report by the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

RULE 16. VOTES

(a) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any bill, resolution or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered thereto, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the committee report on the measure or matter.

(b) In accordance with clause 2(h) of House Rule XI, the Chairman of the Committee or a Subcommittee is authorized to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. Such Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 17. AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be paid from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. The Chairman shall review travel requests to assure the validity to committee business. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(1) the purpose of the travel;

(2) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made;

(3) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and

(4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittees, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee, from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) the purpose of travel;

(B) the dates during which the travel will occur;

(C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) The Chairman shall not approve a request involving travel outside the United States while the House is in session (except in the case of attendance at meetings and conferences or where circumstances warrant an exception).

(4) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting, or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities of the subcommittee and containing the results of these activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, including rules, procedures, and limitations prescribed by the

Committee on House Administration with respect to domestic and foreign expense allowances.

(d) Prior to the Chairman's authorization for any travel, the ranking minority party member shall be given a copy of the written request thereof.

RULE 18. REFERRAL OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) The Chairman shall consult with subcommittee chairmen regarding referral, to the appropriate subcommittees, of such bills, resolutions, and other matters, which have been referred to the committee. Once printed copies of a bill, resolution, or other matter are available to the Committee, the Chairman shall, within three weeks of such availability, provide notice of referral, if any, to the appropriate subcommittee.

(b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the Chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he [or she] intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose, at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) All members of the committee shall be given at least 24 hours' notice prior to the direct consideration of any bill, resolution, or other matter by the committee; but this requirement may be waived upon determination, by a majority of the members voting, that emergency or urgent circumstances require immediate consideration thereof.

RULE 19. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) All committee reports on bills or resolutions shall comply with the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XI and clauses 2, 3, and 4 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) No such report shall be filed until copies of the proposed report have been available to all members at least 36 hours prior to such filing in the House. No material change shall be made in the report distributed to members unless agreed to by majority vote; but any member or members of the committee may file, as part of the printed report, individual, minority, or dissenting views, without regard to the preceding provisions of this rule.

(c) Such 36-hour period shall not conclude earlier than the end of the period provided under clause 4 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives after the committee approves a measure or matter if a member, at the time of such approval, gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion as part of the printed report.

(d) The report on activities of the committee required under clause 1 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, shall include the following disclaimer in the document transmitting the report to the Clerk of the House: "This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and the Workforce or any subcommittee thereof and therefore may not

necessarily reflect the views of its members."

Such disclaimer need not be included if the report was circulated to all members of the committee at least 7 days prior to its submission to the House and provision is made for the filing by any member, as part of the printed report, of individual, minority, or dissenting views.

RULE 20. MEASURES TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION

A member of the committee may not seek to suspend the Rules of the House on any bill, resolution, or other matter which has been modified after such measure is ordered reported, unless notice of such action has been given to the Chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee.

RULE 21. BUDGET & EXPENSES

(a) The Chairman in consultation with the majority party members of the committee shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the committee; and, after consultation with the minority party membership, the Chairman shall include amounts budgeted to the minority party members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority party, travel expenses of minority party members and staff, and minority party office expenses. All travel expenses of minority party members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set aside and budgeted. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the committee duly authorized by the House. After such budget shall have been adopted, no change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the committee. The Chairman or the chairman of any standing subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule 16 within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers therefor.

(b) Subject to the rules of the House of Representatives and procedures prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, and with the prior authorization of the Chairman of the committee in each case, there may be expended in any one session of Congress for necessary travel expenses of witnesses attending hearings in Washington, DC:

(1) out of funds budgeted and set aside for each subcommittee, not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending hearings of each such subcommittee;

(2) out of funds budgeted for the full committee majority, not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full committee hearings; and

(3) out of funds set aside to the minority party members,

(A) not to exceed, for each of the subcommittees, \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending subcommittee hearings, and

(B) not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full committee hearings.

(c) A full and detailed monthly report accounting for all expenditures of committee funds shall be maintained in the committee office, where it shall be available to each member of the committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of each expenditure, and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed.

RULE 22. APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES & NOTICE OF CONFERENCE MEETINGS

(a) Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members of

the subcommittee which handled the legislation in the order of their seniority upon such subcommittee and such other committee members as the Chairman may designate with the approval of the majority party members. Recommendations of the Chairman to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority members to minority party members on the full committee. In making assignments of minority party members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the ranking minority party member of the committee.

(b) After the appointment of conferees pursuant to clause 11 of Rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives for matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, the Chairman shall notify all members appointed to the conference of meetings at least 48 hours before the commencement of the meeting. If such notice is not possible, then notice shall be given as soon as possible.

RULE 23. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS & MEETINGS

(a) Television, Radio and Still Photography. (1) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography subject to the requirements of Rule XI, clause 4 of the Rules of the House of Representatives and except when the hearing or meeting is closed pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives and of the Committee. The coverage of any hearing or meeting of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the Chairman of the Committee, the subcommittee chairman, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing or meeting and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House.

(2) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(3) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(b) Internet Broadcast. An open meeting or hearing of the committee or subcommittee may be covered and recorded, in whole or in part, by Internet broadcast, unless such meeting or hearing is closed pursuant to the Rules of the House and of the Committee. Such coverage shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance clause 4(b) of House Rule XI and other applicable rules of the House of Representatives and of the Committee. Members of the Committee shall have prompt access of any recording of such coverage to the extent that such coverage is maintained. Personnel providing such coverage shall be employees of the House of Representatives or currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

RULE 24. CHANGES IN COMMITTEE RULES

The committee shall not consider a proposed change in these rules unless the text of such change has been delivered or electronically sent to all members and notice of its prior transmission has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to such consideration; a member of the Committee shall receive, upon his or her request, a paper copy of such proposed change.

THE STATUS OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address a very grave matter that affects our country, and that is the status of our budget. It is hard to believe that just 2 years ago when we began the budget process as we do now this country looked forward to a surplus of \$5.6 trillion. That was the projection of the Office of Management and Budget of the Bush administration in January of 2001. We have come a long, long way since January of 2002, since that fiscal year was concluded.

In the last fiscal year of the first Bush administration, there was a deficit of \$290 billion. That was the deficit that President Clinton found on the doorstep waiting for him when he came to the White House on January 20, 1993. On February 17 he sent us a budget that would deal with that deficit, and over the next 8 years every year, every year, the bottom line of the budget got better, better to the point that in 1999 for the first time in 30 years, we balanced the budget.

In the year 2000, we had a surplus of \$236 billion. So from 1992 until the year 2000, we took the budget from \$290 billion in the red, in deficit, to \$236 billion in surplus, a phenomenal record. President Bush the Second came to office, and we gave him an advantage that no President in recent times has ever enjoyed, a balanced budget, a budget that had a surplus the first year he was in office of 126, \$127 billion.

Today, 2 years later, this is what has happened. That surplus cumulative over 10 years, the years 2002 through 2011, has declined from \$5.644 trillion as projected by the Bush Office of Management and Budget to \$2.122 trillion in the red, in deficit. From \$5.6 trillion dollars in the black to \$2.1 trillion in the red, that is a swing in the wrong direction of \$7.2 trillion over a period of 2 years. We have never seen that at least since the Great Depression, such a dramatic fiscal reversal in our account.

That is what we want to address to you tonight because as this next chart will show, we face some decisions in the next couple of months that will determine the fiscal fate of this country for years to come. This is where the Bush administration began 2 years ago. This was a 10-year surplus, \$5.6 trillion. They now say, and these are the numbers presented to us just last week by the Office of Management and Budget, that there was an overcalculation, a miscalculation due to the economy of \$3.174 trillion so that the real surplus was really \$2.463 trillion, \$2.4 trillion instead of \$5.6 trillion.

That is only part of the bad news. The rest of it is that the Bush administration bet the budget on this blue-sky forecast and over the last 2 years has committed \$2.6 trillion in enacting policies, two thirds of which went to tax cuts. We have more than spent the cumulative surplus during that period

of time so that this year we start with a cumulative deficit of \$129 billion.

But the point to note here is that we are going to decide this year, in the next few months, whether we take that deficit, \$129 billion in the red, a bad enough reversal since 2002, and add to it almost \$2 trillion so that we add to the national debt \$2.1 trillion. If we do that, it will be because we have chosen to do that. We could possibly out of abundance of charity say to those who passed the budget 2 years ago they thought they had a \$5.6 trillion surplus, we told them we thought they were overstating it, but we will acknowledge that maybe this was negligence, this was a mistake, this was a miscalculation. Now we have to say if they go forward knowing what they know using their own projection, they will be deliberately, willfully, wantonly, and intentionally adding \$2.1 trillion to the national debt.

Notice that this period of time is a critical period of time in our country's fiscal history because this is when the baby boomers, 77 million of them now marching to their retirement, first begin to retire in 2008. In 2010, 2011 they begin to draw not only their Social Security but their Medicare. So this is a period of time when we should be husbanding our resources so we can meet our obligation to the baby boomers who will be retiring in huge numbers and will double in time the number on Social Security and Medicare. Instead, during that very period of time we are incurring, if we follow the budget proposals before us, mostly the tax cuts proposals that have been made, \$2.122 trillion in additional debt.

A large part of that additional policy will go to tax cuts. This chart shows the Bush tax cut in 2001, \$1.349 trillion in revenues committed to that tax cut. This shows what we did a couple of years ago when we had a first stimulus package to try to get us out of the recession that we felt ourselves slumping into. Now the Bush administration has come up with an additional tax cut. They want to exclude dividends from taxation. I can understand why that would be appealing to a lot of people, but the revenue cost to us of the latest Bush tax proposal is another \$615 billion. Those tax cuts made in June of 2001 were not permanent. In order to shoehorn them into the budget, they artificially terminated or truncated the taxes at the end of 2010.

If we make them permanent, which the Bush administration is proposing, that adds another \$692 billion. Then there is another problem we will not even get into tonight, but it is on the tax agenda. Democrats and Republicans, the Congress and the White House will soon have to face the problem of the alternative minimum tax. Pretty soon millions of Americans will be paying more in the alternative minimum tax than they pay under the regular taxation. If we add all of those together and add the debt service that we have to pay additionally because we

have used these tax cuts to dispense with our revenues, we have got a tax agenda here of \$4.4 trillion. And this is coming at a time when I said we have some critical obligations to meet, we are draining the revenues dry.

□ 1945

Let me just stop on this point and recognize my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Before doing so, look at the next 5 years. These are numbers taken straight from the Bush budget, the Office of Management and Budget. Over the next 5 years, this year, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, they are proposing to spend a deficit of more than \$400 billion in every one of those years.

What is distressing is not necessarily the size of these deficits to start with. If we are, after all, in a slumping economy, you would expect to see a deficit then. But there is no abatement, no reduction. There is no diminution of this deficit in any of these years.

These are the numbers you get if you back out Social Security. The total amount of deficits we will incur in the general fund of the budget if we follow this plan over the next 5 years, 2004 through 2008, is \$2.14 trillion. As I said earlier, that is not the result of what we did previously; that is the result of decisions we are about to make now. This is where it will take us.

Notice that they stop at the end of 5 years. Last year and in 2001 we had a budget that went out 10 years, because we had found from experience that fiscal discipline was served by projecting the consequences of your fiscal actions out as far as you could, and 10 years was deemed to be a good projection period. But if you run this out 10 years, the situation only gets worse.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) to pick up here and talk about some of the consequences in this budget for programs that all Americans support.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for leading the fight for fiscal responsibility in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 years ago the Bush administration promised my then-3 and 5-year-old sons that by the time they graduated from high school, America would have no national debt. A lot can happen in 2 years. Now, under the fiscal policies of this administration, my now-5 and 7-year-old sons are told that before they finish elementary school this administration will add \$1 trillion to \$3 trillion in addition to the total \$6 trillion national debt that we presently have.

To average Americans, what does the national debt really mean? \$6 trillion, \$5 trillion, what does it matter?

Let me talk about the difference. It is said there is one tax in America that cannot be repealed. It is called the debt tax. It is the interest on the national debt. Last year alone, over \$320 billion

was paid in interest on the total national debt of America. That is \$320 billion that taxpayers have to be responsible for now and in the future just to pay the interest on the national debt.

The fact is that not only does the debt tax hurt us by having to pay additional taxes to the Federal Government to pay interest on the debt, but every business is burdened with the debt tax. When you have a deficit, once the economy gets back on its feet, you are going to drive up interest rates. Every homeowner pays part of the debt tax because they have to pay higher interest on the mortgages on their homes. Every consumer that borrows and uses a credit card will have higher taxes in effect because of the Bush administration increase in the national debt.

Now, once in awhile, Mr. Speaker, an idea comes along in Washington, D.C. that is so incredibly unfair that, frankly, it is hard to even believe anyone would propose it seriously. Let me talk about a specific provision of the most recent Bush budget.

This week and in the weeks ahead there will be 12,500 brave men and women, Army soldiers from my district, from Fort Hood, that will be deploying for the Iraqi theater. Within weeks or months they could well be fighting to defend the interests of this country, perhaps even giving their lives for our country.

I found it astounding that the same administration which has ordered these brave men and women, mothers and dads, to go off to potential combat in Iraq, has the gall to suggest that we should be cutting their children's education funds at the same time they are getting on the airplane to defend our country thousands of miles away. It is hard to believe that it is even true, but it is true.

Look at the Bush budget. They are cutting the vital Impact Aid Military Education program at the very time they are asking our sons and daughters, mothers and dads, to go off and defend our country in the Middle East and Southwest Asia. In fact, the two school districts surrounding Fort Hood, the Coppers Cove and Killeen districts around Fort Hood in my district in central Texas, will lose under the Bush administration proposal \$21 million in impact aid this year because of the proposed cuts in that program.

What is compassionately conservative about that? What is fair about that? The truth is, nothing is compassionate about that; nothing is fair about that.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our servicemen and women to make incredible sacrifices for our country, and it is immoral for us to be cutting their children's education funds even as they go to potentially fight for our country.

I hope the American people will be as outraged about not only the largest deficit in the history of America proposed in this budget, but will be just as outraged by the unfairness to our serv-

icemen and women all across America by cutting their children's education programs while they are going off to war.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things we could talk about in this budget, but one of the things I would like to ask the distinguished ranking member about is, I have heard in recent days from Republican colleagues that the Bush administration tax cuts, both those already enacted and those proposed, really are not a significant part of the reason we now have this year proposed the largest deficit in the history of America.

I would like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), if that is true. Have these proposed taxes and enacted tax cuts really had a minimal effect on the fact we are in such a deep deficit hole now?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, on the chart I have just displayed it is clear from the Office of Management and Budget that the real surplus adjusted for the real economy over the last couple of years is not \$5.6 trillion, but \$2.4 trillion. Out of that \$2.4 trillion in real surplus, the Bush administration has already cut \$1.349 trillion and \$42 billion; add those two together and you get easily \$1.4 trillion. Nearly two-thirds of the remaining surplus has been cut, has been diminished, due to tax cuts already passed now in the face of the fact that there is no remaining surplus.

After you factor in these tax cuts and factor in the spending increases, mainly for defense and homeland security, which we all supported, but nevertheless, his budget left no room for contingencies like that, when you factor in those additional spending items, the surplus not only disappears, it goes deep in deficit for as far as the eye can see.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentleman pointing out those facts. I would also point out on this chart that the Bush administration's total tax agenda, including tax cuts already enacted plus proposed tax cuts, total in impact, if you count that increased debt tax, the interest we have to pay when we borrow money, it is over \$4.3 trillion. Even by Washington, D.C., standards it seems to me a trillion here and a trillion there really is a significant amount of money.

I find it astounding that we are cutting taxes for some of the wealthiest people in America, and at the same time, telling soldiers at Fort Hood in central Texas, right next to the Crawford ranch, you have to go off and fight for our country, but by the way, as they are getting on the plane, give them a note, we are going to cut your children's education fund.

We hear a lot of talk, and I will finish with this, about values in Washington, D.C., and family values. But I think we in public office should be judged not by rhetoric, but by our record and by the priorities we set in the Federal budget.

There is something wrong with the values of an administration that would propose cutting impact military education funds not to pay for a war against Iraq, but to pay for the tax dividend for the other constituent of mine who said he made \$1 million in dividend income last year, and because this administration does not want him to pay one dime in taxes, will get a \$335,000 tax cut.

Would the gentleman care to comment about the values of those priorities?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me enlarge upon the point the gentleman is making, and that is, as bad as the Bush administration says, when pressed, where is your solution, what plan do you have? Cut spending, cut spending.

In truth, as the gentleman is pointing out with a very specific example, there are plenty of spending cuts built into this budget already. One of them is impact aid, which amounts to the Federal Government saying to military installations, we are not going to pick up the full impact of the children of military dependents in the public schools in that particular locality. We are going to let the local folks pay that and not do what other employers do and continue contributing some of the costs of it. That is one example.

The gentleman from North Carolina is going to get up and give another example about the larger education bill that already is cut in this bill. If you took the whole budget for discretionary spending, the 13 appropriation bills that the gentleman's committee reports and we pass, which constitutes the discretionary budget, if you take all of nondefense discretionary spending and cut it all out, it would not replace the \$400 billion deficit in the general fund we expect next year.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, that is a good point. If the gentleman will let me ask one last question, and then I will defer to other members that want to speak on the largest deficit in the history of America, there are a lot of Americans that believe that this largest proposed deficit in America's 200-plus-year history is because, my gosh, we are going to have to pay for the war against Iraq.

Could the gentleman tell me and the American people factually, is the \$300 billion deficit proposed for this 1 year alone related to that?

Mr. SPRATT. That does not include the war against Iraq. That does not include the war against terror. The Secretary of Defense told us the other day, if and when those costs come, we will send up a supplemental. If you add that to the bottom line, it gets worse.

Mr. EDWARDS. We could have a \$400-plus billion deficit. I did calculate it. I think the maximum Pell Grant for a young, bright high school senior from a low income family, wanting to improve his or her life and career with a college education, they get about \$4,000 a year. If you assume 4 percent interest on the

\$300 billion deficit this year alone, that means my children's generation, my little boy's generation, will pay \$12 billion a year, that is B as in boy, \$12 billion a year in tax for the rest of their lives until the day they die simply to pay the interest on this year's proposed deficit.

That amount of money, if we had a more fiscally prudent budget without some of these tax cuts that I think are irresponsible, that would allow us to have 3 million young Americans receive a \$4,000 Pell Grant. Something is wrong with these values and something is wrong with this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Let me now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), who used to be the Superintendent of Education in North Carolina, to further the effects of some of cuts in education in this budget.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me follow up something that my good friend from Texas covered; whether one agrees with this or not, this is actual fact. Before I was the State Superintendent of Schools in North Carolina, I chaired the appropriations committee for the general assembly, and prior to that I was a county commissioner.

What we are really doing in saying to local governments about pulling back impact aid, and in many of the cases, in many of the communities, in Fort Bragg in my district, many of these communities find themselves dependent on the impact aid. But what happens is they are getting impact aid because you have a large Federal installation not paying local property taxes. If you pull that out, in effect you are saying to the rest of the citizens in that jurisdiction, we are going to raise your taxes. We are going to say to the county commissioners to raise them or to the local governments at a time when roughly, what, 70-plus percent of the States are running huge deficits.

Mr. Speaker, it is incomprehensible that this administration would place these kinds of burdens on local governments across this country. And I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), who said not only Fort Hood, but at Fort Bragg, which is the 9/11 post in this country, we are going to send you off, but the people that you are going to leave behind are going to pick up the tab, because those of us in Washington are not going to do what we need to do, and those of us left are going to raise your taxes another way.

Let me touch on a couple of other issues when it comes to education. It bothers me greatly, because if we truly want to turn this around, we have got to have prudence now in budgeting.

Mr. Speaker, it boggles my mind that we have come through the deficits of the last 10 years to get to some high ground and a balanced budget, and we did not learn a thing. We jumped right back in that briar patch with no end in sight, and we now say deficits are okay.

□ 2000

They are not okay. Because we are going to double the amount of interest over the next few years, and my children and grandchildren will pick up the tab; and that is wrong.

Let us just look at some of the numbers that are proposed in this budget. These are the consequences of running deficits: cuts in No Child Left Behind. I supported that legislation because I thought it was fair and it would make a difference for children, because the President committed to fund it. And what does he do? He has cut the funding, and I will have a proposal on that before too long. This budget proposes cuts of \$22.6 billion for programs that are under No Child Left Behind, which is \$9 billion below the amount authorized in 2004, and \$199 million below the amount needed to maintain at just the 2002 level.

Now, we have to understand that there are more children coming to school, there are more children with needs, there is more tutoring that needs to be done because we are ratcheting up accountability. It is a program for disaster for the public schools of America; and this administration, I do believe, knows that, and they ought to know better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is talking about is the authorization act Mr. Bush signed and signed into law and took credit for.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. And this body bipartisanly passed it.

Mr. SPRATT. The authorization act calls for \$9 billion more in the fiscal year 2004 than his budget in this year's request.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. That is exactly right. And the schools are depending on that money, and at a time, as the gentleman knows, when States are cutting because they do not have the resources, trying to hold up their end on education; and we are not living up to our bargain. This administration has not been honest with, I think, our schools and the American people.

It eliminates 47 education programs in this budget, proposed budget. Those programs amount to \$1.6 billion just in the CR we are now operating under, on the flat line, \$1.6 billion. That is a lot of money when you get out to a local school building in rural America or wherever you may be.

Let me just talk about some of the major cuts. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers, an outstanding program that gives schools money to do some creative things that make a difference.

Mr. SPRATT. After-school programs, primarily?

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Absolutely.

Mr. SPRATT. Before-school programs.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Absolutely. We absolutely have to have these if we are going to tutor youngsters who are behind and need to catch up. Mr. Speaker, \$1.2 billion below the level authorized. Teacher quality programs, the

very thing we have to do if we are going to improve education in America. We have to improve opportunity for the staff that are teaching our children. What did we do? What does the President propose? Mr. Speaker, \$3.1 billion, down 5.2 percent from the previous level. I will just go through the percentages. It is just shameful.

Educational technology. At a time when we are really trying to put more technology in the schools because we are in a technological world, and so many schools need the resources, 9.6 percent cut from the previous level. More children out there, more needs, and we are cutting.

Impact Aid, we just talked about, 14.2 percent. Vocational education, 26 percent proposed cut; 26 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a story I heard once when I was little. The guy said he was not going to kill his pig, he would just do a little bit at a time, and somebody saw a pig running around the yard with three legs, and he said, I am just eating a little bit at a time. That is what we are doing to education. We are not going to kill it all at once; we are just going to kill it a little bit at a time, until it is so crippled it cannot work. It is absurd.

We need people to work on equipment and machinery. I was at a school last week; a superintendent came up to me just last night talking about Impact Aid. He said, if we cut it, our schools are going to be in deep trouble. This was in Cumberland County. One of the teachers talked about vocational education. This is where they turn money into technology for computer labs. I was in a computer lab working with children.

Funding for the improvement of education, down 91.2 percent. I do not know why they did not go ahead and get it all.

I mean it just makes no sense. It was a good program, but what they want to do is just enough out there to make people mad.

Perkins loans, 61 percent proposed cut.

I could go on. I think folks who are watching get the message. It is one thing to say I am for education; it is one thing to say I want to help. It is another thing to not follow through and give the resources. I have talked to more teachers and school folks in the last few weeks. They really and truly believe, whether it is true or not, that they are set on a course to fail, because we are giving them all the ingredients to make the cake and nothing to go in it, but we are expecting them to come out with a fine baked product.

I would remind all of my colleagues, education is a lifelong process, and we cannot start and stop it. We have to keep it going. Teachers understand it; students realize it. It takes resources to get the job done. I recognize that at the Federal level we only put in about 7 to 9 percent, depending on where we are. Some counties it is more, because a lot of it is specific to need. Not all of

this is specific to need, because No Child Left Behind is need-based and categorical. But without it, we are really saying, we really did not mean it. We really did not mean it.

That was a great plan, we got a lot of good press on it, we have had our press clippings, we have been around the country, and now we are going to move on to something else. That is not education. That is not about building the future of America, and this administration knows better. I am going to be on the floor in the well of this House every day, every week; and we are going to keep reminding them. We have to do the funding because if we do not, we will not have a future. We cannot keep running deficits because huge deficits have consequences; and the consequences are, we run up the debt, we have huge interest payments, and it squeezes out domestic programs, and children pay a heavy price, and we rob our future so a few people can look good now.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's point, and the point of the gentleman before him, was that even in this budget with big deficits, \$400 billion and more every year for the next 5 years, \$2.1 trillion in the general fund, additional deficits, additional debt; even with those bottom lines, we have these significant cuts already made in this budget, and we are still running almost a half a trillion dollars in the red every year.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Sure, and the gentleman's point is it will get worse.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, to further explain and clarify other things that are buried in this budget is the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), to whom I now yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to again show this chart which shows over the years the spending of the Federal Government.

Now, a picture is worth a thousand words. We see under the Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter administration in yellow where the deficit was; we see what happened to the deficit during the Reagan and Bush years; and we see when Bill Clinton came in office under Democratic leadership, we passed a budget that reduced the deficit. Now, when this vote was taken in 1993, not a single Republican supported that budget. And right after that happened, we reduced the deficit. Slowly but surely each year the deficit became less and less and less until we started running a surplus. When President Bush came in, we reversed course. We cannot produce charts like this by accident.

Now, we have been asked, where is your plan? There is our plan. When the Democrats controlled the budget, that is, when the Democrats controlled the House in 1993 and the Senate in 1993 and the President, we passed the budget. In these years, President Clinton vetoed many Republican budgets. They tried to close the government down, he vetoed the budget anyway, because

they were fiscally irresponsible. So President Clinton was the controlling force of the budget during his administration and produced those years. The budget introduced by President Bush was passed when he came in office, and this is what happened. We wonder what the plan is for the future.

As it has been mentioned, when he came in office, in 2000, there was a surplus. September 11 happened with only 3 weeks left in the fiscal year, so this was going to happen anyway, that is, spending virtually all of Medicare. The following year we spent all of the Medicare surplus, all of the Social Security surplus, and then \$160 billion more. In 2003, almost \$300 billion, after we spent all of Social Security and Medicare; and if we adopt the policies of the administration, we are going to be spending all of Social Security and Medicare for years to come.

Now, what kinds of tax cuts are we recommending now? I mean, we do not produce numbers like this by accident.

We have tax cuts like the repeal of the taxes on estates over \$2 million. A husband and wife, \$2 million tax-free going to the next generation. \$2 million. Then we start taxing after that. So when we talk about repealing the estate tax, we are talking about repealing the tax on dead multimillionaires. That is what we are talking about. When we add to that the idea that they want to stop taxing dividends, we have a bizarre vision for America where people can inherit great wealth, invest it in stocks, live off the dividends tax-free, no tax on the estate, on the inheritance, no tax on the dividends. When we add to that some other provisions in this budget where we protect capital from taxes, we know what Leona Helmsley was talking about when she said, only little people pay taxes, because those with great wealth can shelter that wealth with no estate tax, no tax on dividends, and the other little provisions in the bill where capital is not taxed, only little people will pay taxes. Every time we cut another tax, it is down here. We have already gone through the surplus and Social Security and Medicare.

Now, what is the impact of this? When we started, the projection was that the entire national debt would be paid, held by the public, we would have paid off all of that by 2008, and going into pay-off of all of the debt on the trust funds by 2011, 2013. We would be debt-free. Instead, we are on this line: more and more debt.

Now, we cannot run up debt without consequences. What is the first consequence? The debt tax. This is what the family of four pays every year in interest on the national debt. As we run up more debt, we have to pay more debt tax, more interest on the national debt. It is around \$4,500 for a family of four now; and because we are running up the debt, by 2008, almost \$6,500 every year, a family of four will have to pay just on the debt.

We do not get anything for that. That has already been spent.

Now, when we look at how the debt tax is exploding and the burden on the Federal Government on just interest on the national debt is exploding, we have an interesting phenomenon that we have to deal with, and that is Social Security. We are running a surplus in Social Security now. By 2037, we will be running a huge deficit. We need to be piling up resources, reserves so that as the baby boomers retire and the expense of Social Security gets less and less, we have some way to pay it. No, instead, we are running up massive debts when we have the surplus.

What is the plan to pay Social Security later on? I would suggest that they have no intention of paying Social Security.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me just clarify the chart the gentleman has, which is very graphic. The blue bar charts, the blue bars above the horizontal axis show the surplus that is accumulating in Social Security, for now.

□ 2015

But it is for a limited period of time, intended to be used for parents, for the retirement of the baby boomers. The red bars that get deeper and deeper as you approach 2037 show the net cash outflow in the Social Security trust fund beginning in about 2017, which is not that far away, 13, 14 years from now.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. When we consider that we are spending the entire surplus, to continue spending at that rate, we will not have that surplus in 2017. So we are going to have to figure out, have some plan to figure out how to pay that. Are we going to raise taxes? Are we going to cut spending? The gentleman has already indicated that we could eliminate the entire Federal budget that is nondefense, discretionary spending, we can eliminate the entire budget, that is, no roads, no education, NASA, everything, State Department, foreign aid. Get rid of all of it. Not cut it, eliminate it, and not be able to cover the on-budget deficit that we are running up now.

So where are we going to get it? Are they going to raise taxes in 2017? And then not only do they not have the cushion, since we do not have the reserve, we are spending it; how will we come up with this money? Frankly, I do not think they will come up with the money. They will just repeal Social Security. And if that is not the plan, they ought to have some way of explaining how they will pay Social Security in the future.

The President, in one of his addresses to Congress, said he intended to maintain Social Security for those retiring and those close to retirement, which suggests to me that these people down here will not have any Social Security. If they have no coherent plan, they ought to admit that they will eliminate Social Security. And if they intend to pay Social Security, they ought to have some coherent plan to

show how they are going to do it. All they are doing now is running up debt. We cannot continue to do that. A family of four is already up to \$6,500 interest on the national debt. It is getting worse before it gets better.

How are they going to pay Social Security? I think they have a stealth plan to eliminate Social Security when the burden becomes too deep. They have got all these retirement plans so that all those who are privileged to have inherited wealth, they will be all right. But the vast majority of Americans with no pension plan will be back where they were before Social Security was there.

We need answers. They are not delivering answers. They are not making any tough choices like we made in 1993, tough choices that converted deficits into surpluses. They are not making any tough choices. All the easy choices. Anybody who wants a tax cut gets one. Anybody who wants some spending gets spending, unless it is education or something important. You do not get those. How are they going to pay this?

So I think they need to come forward and explain how they will do this without eliminating Social Security. And if you listen to their remarks talking about personal responsibility, you assume that sooner or later your retirement will be your personal responsibility. There will not be any Social Security to keep you out of poverty.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Now I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) who was here from 1983 until 1994 when he ran for Senate from Tennessee. But before leaving the House of Representatives he cast one of the hard votes that a number of us mustered the courage to pass and that was a vote for the Clinton budget in 1993, which laid the foundation for a decade of fiscal progress during the 1990s, a period when the bottom line of the budget got better and better and better every year until finally, in 1998-1999 we were in surplus for the first time in 30 years.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). I appreciate your leadership on these vitally important issues. I think many patriotic Americans wonder what those moments are in American history when we really do reach a turning point; and to be honest with you, in all the congressional debates there are very few real turning points. But I would like to suggest, as the gentleman has already suggested, 1993 was a turning point when this Nation literally reversed its fiscal policy and finally set our Nation on track towards reaching surpluses which many Americans had given up on ever seeing again.

And I would like to suggest that this year, 2003, is another such turning point, as we dig deeper into the hole of deficits and plunge future generations into what is likely to be a permanent and unresolvable debt load.

Our friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT of Virginia), has already pointed out this chart, and I would like to suggest that this should be on everyone's screen saver, on every computer in America as we put the deficit in perspective.

They were relatively inconsequential in the Carter years, the Nixon/Ford years. But then with President Reagan we plunged into a sea of red ink which many Americans thought was irreversible. Then in the crucial budget vote in 1993, suddenly we got an upturn, even developing a surplus.

But then again, another pivot point in American history under George W. Bush and his budgets, we are reaching even graver levels of deficit and debt.

I think the gentleman will recognize that many of our constituents just have an instinctive feeling that, well, the President is a Republican and, therefore, he is conservative and, therefore, his budget must be conservative.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from South Carolina think that deficits of this magnitude are conservative?

Mr. SPRATT. Absolutely not.

Mr. COOPER. As I recall, the gentleman has already said these are about to be the largest deficits in history. Is that conservative?

Mr. SPRATT. We warned that this would happen, but we did not see, even in our admonitions, the severity of the problem we have before us now.

Mr. COOPER. As I recall, the gentleman has said that the deficit for fiscal year 2004 is supposed to be about \$300 billion, not counting the war in Iraq, not counting the war in Afghanistan, not counting the war on terrorism, not counting other important problems that need to be solved in our Nation. So the deficit may well be \$400 or even \$500 billion.

A temporary deficit is one thing. As we know, sometimes a deficit is appropriate to stimulate the economy, but what we are talking about are permanent structural deficits in our economy.

Mr. SPRATT. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman was in the investment banking business for a period. He knows the name Goldman Sachs. And I understand one of their economists today said they predict that the unified deficit for this year will be in the \$400 billion range. That means that is after netting out, backing out the Social Security surplus. The unified deficit, by their projection, will be in the \$400 billion range this year.

That is depressing enough, but the problem is those deficits continue on and on and on without any abatement.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is so correct. And a huge deficit like that hurts our economy. It creates higher interest rates. It hurts the employment statistics. And as I think most of the world knows, under the Clinton years we had the most robust economy in the history of this Nation or the history of

the world. Surpluses helped us. Fiscal discipline helped us. That is important for us to realize now as we are returning to the era of massive budget deficits.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has displayed great leadership, but I worry so many folks back home find these numbers too large to be comprehended. They are confused. They are over-burdened in their daily lives. They are worried about the war. They are worried about unemployment. They do not know really how to grapple with numbers of this magnitude. But this chart shows it better than anything else, this sea of red ink that we are passing on to the next generation.

President Bush mentioned in his State of the Union that each Congress, each President should take care of its own problems, but this budget is not doing that.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) remember the vote in 1993?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I do. It was a very close vote. As I recall, it was by a one-vote margin the Clinton budget was passed.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman remember how many Republicans voted for that budget?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as I remember, zero. In fact, they excoriated the President's budget saying that it would lead to depression and other crises in the economy.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And we made those tough choices without any Republican help, House or Senate.

And does the gentleman remember what they did in the next election? When they demagogued that vote, said we made the tough choices, criticized those choices, and they won 50 seats in the next election.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, many Members were defeated for having done the courageous thing, for having been a profile in courage.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, now we turn over a surplus to President Bush and he has made no tough choices. He has cut taxes and increased spending. Have they recommended any tough choices?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, they are few and far between in this budget. It is a massive document of some 20,000 pages, I suppose. It contains many crippling cuts to our programs. Our colleague from North Carolina mentioned several of them in the education area. There are so many features that I hope the public will be aware of and we will try to bring out in the debate.

One feature that is particularly concerning to me is an unconstitutional provision that is in the President's budget. It is little known. It is on page 318 of the analytical prospectus of the second or third volume of the budget. It actually says, if Congress has not completed its business by October 1 of

this year, the budget will automatically revert to the President's budget; whereas, the Constitution of the United States gives that power exclusively to the Congress of the United States, not to the White House.

And that allows this administration, with a handful of Senators, to clog up the budget process, and then automatically, without a single vote taken by this body, turn over the budget to this administration. That is one of the most radical proposals I have ever heard mentioned in public policy debates. And yet it is in this President's budget.

That is why I asked, as I mentioned to the gentleman from South Carolina earlier, this is not a conservative budget. There is a radical budget. This is an irresponsible budget that is leading our Nation perhaps on the road to ruin. No American wants to see that.

It is the responsibility of a two-party system to point out problems. And certainly Democratic budgets in the past have sometimes not been perfect, but we can be proud of this record of actually achieving a budget surplus for the first time in American history, I think, since before the Depression, 3 straight years of surplus were achieved. And that is an important record of achievement that we need to continue, not a road with this massive flood of red ink.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the point I was making at the outset is, 2 years ago OMB projected a surplus of \$5.6 trillion. The Bush administration then enacted a massive tax cut taking advantage of that big surplus. They now acknowledge that they overstated, miscalculated by some \$3.2 trillion. It really was not \$5.6 trillion in surplus. It was more like \$2.4 trillion in surplus.

The problem is that tax cuts have largely already committed that amount of money. As we begin this fiscal year, instead of having a cushion fund, a huge surplus of \$5.6 trillion, we are in the red. We have fully dissipated that surplus and we are in the red \$129 billion.

But they, knowing that, proposed additional tax cuts and additional measures that would drive us deeper in the red over the next 5 years to the tune of \$2.1 trillion which is intentional. You could at least excuse what happened before as negligent miscalculation. I do not. I think they should have seen the storm clouds gathering over the economy and understand that the surplus was overstated; but chalk it up to negligence. This is willful, wanton, and intentional.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman talks about the calculation being a miscalculation, is some of the calculation not a recalculation based on how poorly the economy was doing after the President's budget was adopted?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it. A lot of the economic effect was already in place before 9/11. That is a key point to understand.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, after the President's budget was adopt-

ed, the economy kept going down and down. And so some of this recalculation is an acknowledgment that the President's budget had caused the economy to tank, and they had to recalculate it based on the new numbers.

When President Clinton's budget was adopted, they always underestimated the effect because that budget was improving the economy and every year the economy was doing even better than expected. The stock market was improving; unemployment was going down.

When this President's budget was adopted, things just kept getting worse. And they had to recalculate it based on that new forecast. So it is all not just technical miscalculations. Some of it, a lot of it, is recalculation based on how poorly the economy was doing.

Mr. SPRATT. Furthermore, we now know that the surplus is gone, per OMB. They have acknowledged it. CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says the same thing. That ought to be an alarm sound calling for us to begin developing plans like the plan we developed with the President's father in 1990, the Budget Summit Agreement, the Clinton budget in 1993, the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. Three times in the 1990s we did extra-special exercises on the budget that ratcheted down and helped put us in a surplus for the first time in a generation.

□ 2030

This budget acknowledging the problems it has got now and in the foreseeable future does nothing. The most that they offer is a new disdain for deficits. They basically say deficits do not matter, a trillion here, a trillion there; it is no big deal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I do.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Does the gentleman know who said the budget deficit is a stealth tax that pushes up interest rates and costs the typical family \$36,000 on an average home mortgage, \$1,400 on an ordinary student loan and \$700 on a car loan?

Mr. SPRATT. That is Senator DOLE, I think. The point we are trying to make now is that we may have a tax cut today, but if it ends up causing the government to incur more debt, the debt has to be paid. It has to be serviced. Interest on it has to be paid; and eventually, the people that pay taxes will have to service that debt, and there is a debt tax, a stealth tax that will come due, not in the near term, but whenever we do not have a surplus to charge it to anymore, and we do not, then what we do is charge it to the next generation, and that means our children and grandchildren.

So we can have it all in this budget. They pay the tax. They pay the bill, the debt tax.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is so correct. He made an extremely

important point a moment ago. So many people in the other party feel that deficits do not matter, deficits do not matter; and I think that philosophy is not only wrong, it could lead our Nation into serious economic trouble for decades to come.

I would like to suggest to the gentleman, I even heard some of my colleagues across the aisle say that deficits are a good thing. There is an article today in the New York Times quoting a leader in the other party saying that a deficit is a good thing because they shrink the size of government; and I would suggest that sort of philosophy is not only not conservative, it is one of the most radical approaches to government that I have ever heard of, to pretend that red ink of this volume and dimension does not matter and that it could actually be a good thing.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The gentleman indicated that deficits reduce the size of government. Is this budget coming in not presented to us larger than the one before? So it does not reduce the size of government. When we cut all these taxes and reduce revenue, we are not reducing the size of government. We are just running up debt on which we have to pay interest.

Mr. COOPER. As the gentleman from Virginia so wisely pointed out, that puts a debt tax, an unrepeatable tax on future generations for all time in the amount of \$12 billion forever just due to the debt we are running up this year. That is an irresponsible fiscal policy. That is a radical fiscal policy. It is not a conservative fiscal policy.

I think that is what so many of our constituents back home are failing to realize because these numbers are so large, the problems seem so vast, they are preoccupied with the war and with their own personal situation, that when they are presented with a multi-trillion dollar budget, it is hard to take it seriously, when, in fact, we are reaching a turning point in American history, and we do need to take action, we need to bring these problems to the American people's attention so that they can respond and call for fiscal responsibility and fiscal sanity because we are not seeing enough of that today in Washington, D.C.

I would like to commend the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Virginia for their comments.

Mr. SPRATT. Let me wrap up and let us bring it to a conclusion because the gentleman has been in investment banking for the last 6 or 7 years, and the gentleman knows that traditional economic theory for as long as we have known anything about it has held that deficits have the same effect that any supply and demand function has. The government goes into the capital markets. In addition to private borrowers, it elbows out the private borrowers. It runs up interest rates, and high interest rates stifle growth in the long run.

So we may get a little bit of kick right now out of running a deficit, but

in the long run we have got the debt to pay; it is a fiscal drag on the economy.

Secondly, it is a form of dissaving. When the government borrows the money it is just like an individual borrowing money. He is dissaving rather than actually saving and that takes away from the savings pool that we have got for capital formation and building the productive assets of this country, and over the long run it means we are not as productive as we otherwise would be.

Then, finally, there is a moral aspect, which I just mentioned. When we charge our excesses to the deficit, we are charging it to the next generation, namely, our children and grandchildren. No way around it. Everybody's recognized that moral aspect in the past. This is an intergenerational thing. They will not only have to pay our Social Security deficit and Medicare deficit, they will also have to pick up the accumulated debts, the other things that we chose not to pay in our time because of this budget.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is an excellent economist, and another great economist is our own Federal Reserve chairman, Alan Greenspan, who said, History suggests that an abandonment of fiscal discipline will eventually push up interest rates, so deficits do matter, crowd out capital spending, lower productivity growth, and force harder choices on us in the future.

We should be listening to Alan Greenspan. We should be listening to the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Virginia because deficits do matter. They are hurting this economy, and we need to return to the fiscal discipline that we saw in the previous administration and live within our means because our Nation is embarking on long-term structural deficits today that we may never be able to erase.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, on that point we conclude. I thank the gentlemen for participating.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for their comments on the budget. I think that their ideas are useful and good. I think they also know, and although they were not really talking about it, that we are at war. America has been attacked. America needs to respond. At this point, America continues to be the world leader.

It is interesting that when people say, well, why do we have 37,000 troops in South Korea? Well, if we talk to the folks who live in South Korea or in China or Japan, and say maybe we should move those 37,000 folks, bring

them on home. Well, no, no, no. If we do that, then there is world instability, particularly in this region of the world which is stable right now. Do not pull them out, and yet America has to respond when North Korea, largely because of the inept policies of the previous administration, goes on an accelerated path to nuclear weapon development, then America has to step in there.

Unfortunately, so many of these things cost a lot of money. Thirty-seven thousand troops in the Korean peninsula, that is very expensive; and we have troops in Afghanistan. We have troops in the Balkans still; and of course, we have troops right now in Kuwait and in the Middle East.

I think as much as none of us want a deficit, I believe all of us, even the doves in this body, even the folks who feel like France and Germany are right, I think that they would admit that we have to defend ourselves, and so we do have a deficit budget. I do not like it anymore than anybody else, and I know the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, is going to do everything he can to bring down the deficit and move us back into surplus.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it is more important for America to survive; and I think as I have seen so many of our troops from Fort Stewart deployed, the third infantry division which I am proud to be wearing their emblem tonight, I think we have got to keep in mind these soldiers are out there in the foxholes for our freedom and our security, and they need great equipment. They need modern equipment. They need readiness in all areas of the globe. So our budget addresses is.

In fact, our budget, which for fiscal year 2004, will be about \$2.2 trillion. That is a 4 percent increase. I would like to, frankly, see it decreased, but again, with the world situation, sometimes we cannot control this.

About 5 percent of that increase comes directly because of military, and then in the other categories, not all of them, there are a lot of reductions; but there is about a 3 percent increase, and that is comparable to the average family budget.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to meet the Chair's family this last weekend, and my family, some of them were with us and some of them were not; but Libby and I have four children, and one thing about it, when a person is raising kids, they never have quite enough money. They have to buy. They do not begrudge it. They have got to buy their clothes and school supplies, and then if they play sports, they have got to buy sports equipment; and what I found out, much to my chagrin, is that if John Kingston is playing football, he cannot use the same cleats for soccer and baseball, whereas the Chair and I, Mr. Speaker, had one pair of cleats fit all.

In fact, I went back to my elementary school baseball picture, and half

the boys on the baseball team were barefooted. But not so today. These kids today have to have \$60 and \$70 of tennis shoes and that is part of being a family these days. We have got all those expenses and then doggone it, we save up a little money and say, well, we are going to sneak on down to Florida, spend the weekend in Daytona, have some fun. Well, the washer breaks or we have got to do something as glorious as buy a new set of tires for our car or we have got to do something else that is not as much fun, but it is essential to spend money on.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what President Bush has done with this budget. He said there is a lot of things out there that we want to have, but we are not going to be able to do; but there are other things out there that we need to do, and we are going to do that.

One of these things, Mr. Speaker, along with the troops, is trying to get jobs going because nothing will turn the economy around more than jobs.

I am not sure where the Democrats in this body go to school. I am sure they go to some good public schools and some good private schools; but, Mr. Speaker, somehow they failed in economics and history because economics and history will show us that President Kennedy and President Reagan reduced taxes; and when they did, the economy responded and created more jobs, and more revenue came in. In fact, it doubled in these cases; and if we just think about it for a minute, it makes sense.

Under the Bush tax reduction, 92 million Americans will get about a \$1,000 tax reduction; 34 million American with children will get \$1,400 in their pocket; 6 million single mothers will get \$541 in their pocket; and 13 million elderly taxpayers will get \$1,384 in their pocket.

If someone puts \$1,000 in my pocket, I am going to try to spend some of it, and I am going to try to save some of it. I want to save some for my kids' college education, want to save some for my own retirement; but also I am more likely going out and maybe buy that new shirt that I know I have been needing to buy or maybe buy something for the house that I needed to get, get a new crock pot for the kitchen or something like that.

When I do that, small businesses will respond. They will say, hey, look, more consumers are buying, they have got more money in their pocket, let us put on a new shelf of inventory. When we do that, hey, we need a new salesclerk to help us move this inventory. When the new salesclerk comes, well, suddenly we have got somebody who may have been on welfare before who is now working, and then they are paying taxes; and before we know it, the revenue to the local government, to the State government and the Federal Government goes straight up. That is the idea behind the tax reduction; and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is one reason why we need to pass it and pass it now.

The Democrats' thinking on this model is, okay, we will vote for the tax

cut, but we want to postpone it. We do not want it, so married couples should not be having the marriage tax penalty, and we agree with that, but we do not want that to take place for 4 or 5 years. Well, hey, if it is right, do it today; and that is what the Bush plan is, is to accelerate these things.

But I think this is part of our budget, Mr. Speaker, because turning the economy around is so very important; and when the Republican conservative economic policies kicked in in 1995 after the Republicans took over this body, the President at the time reluctantly helped us pass some tax reductions. The economy took off and revenues went up, and we were able to balance the budget.

So I believe that it is very timely to pass a tax reduction to reduce the deficit, and I hope that our Democrat friends will join us in that as they have in the past.

The average American family has an income of \$39,000. This cut would provide them with an additional \$1,100 a year. Again, Mr. Speaker, that is significant money and something that we want to do.

I also wanted to comment on some other issues tonight, Mr. Speaker. The situation in Iraq. As I mentioned earlier today, I had the opportunity to meet with the wives whose husbands are in the third infantry division, Fort Stewart, Hunter and Savannah, Georgia. About 18,000 soldiers are deployed to the Middle East right now, a huge loss in our area in terms of our neighbors and our friends; but we cannot have soldiers in the field without the families back home.

□ 2045

We cannot have an army in the field without the supply folks back home making sure that the Army has the material they need to fight the war. And these women in the Fort Stewart-Hunter Wives Organization are just as brave as the soldiers on the front line. Indeed, they are on the emotional front line. One of the messages that I gave them was that 435 Members of Congress, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, city, rural, everybody appreciated what they were doing, staying at home.

Even if you are in Kuwait, you are often dealing with other adults, and sometimes that is easier than dealing with children back home who lose their books, who lose their shoes, who need to be picked up at 3 o'clock but do not show up until 3:20, and, in the meantime, across town you have soccer practice. And then you have other financial problems: taxes that are due, insurance payments, should you take the higher deductible, the lower deductible, do we still need collision insurance, and then there is the home mortgage renegotiation. Hey, interest rates are down. We are paying 6, 7 percent interest. Maybe we can get an adjustable rate mortgage for 2½ percent. How do I do this? Oh no, Mom is sick

and I am going to have to go back to Chicago. I'll have to arrange for the kids back home, because I have got to see what Mom's needs are. My goodness, maybe it is time to put Dad in the nursing home. Do we do this? I have to call my brother in from Seattle.

These are the day-to-day questions facing these families back home. It is very, very difficult. And I think we should at all times, whenever we are thinking about the soldiers in the field, we should also remember the families back home.

I think we should also be appreciative of the great job that groups like the USO, the United Service Organizations, the Red Cross, groups like Southern Smiles and other volunteer groups across the country who are sending care packages to these soldiers and remembering them; getting them Chapstick, getting them soap, getting them deodorant, getting them comic books and getting them Bibles.

In fact, when I went to see some of our soldiers depart, as they were getting on the plane, the Red Cross was giving out camouflage Bibles. I never had seen a camouflaged Bible before, but I know that within the binder of that book is the truth that surpasses all understanding and that everybody needs these words of comfort in times of peril.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to talk a little bit more about the war protesters, because we hear so many people in America who think that we are the aggressive country here. And a lot of folks are asking, well, why are we at war? The truth is so many of these war protesters do not want to hear the facts on it, but I wanted to go over some of these things.

First of all, let us remember, Saddam Hussein and Iraq have invaded their own Middle Eastern neighbors, Iran and Kuwait. They are a factor of instability in their own region of the world. Indeed, it is obvious at times like these that we do not see any of their neighbors coming to their aid. They are not jumping up and down to say "Go America," for obvious reasons; but why is it that these countries are not coming to the aid of Saddam Hussein, if he is such a great person, according to some of the war protesters?

We know for a fact that he has violated 16 U.N. treaties that have been passed since Desert Storm, and yet in the face of that, the U.N. seems very reluctant to enforce their own treaties. So again it has to come back to America, and America is the one that has to do something about it.

Saddam Hussein has not accounted for 25,000 liters of anthrax. He has not accounted for 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin. He has not accounted for 500 tons of Sarin, mustard and VX nerve agent. Item after item which the weapons inspectors have tried to put their finger on he has hidden from them. This is why we are concerned about what is going on in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I have been joined by my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) and we are going to talk about a judicial nominee; but before we go to that, I wanted to invite my friend from Florida to jump in on the question of Iraq. I know in the great State of Florida, just like Georgia, the gentleman has a lot of anti-war protestors.

I have heard Richard Armitage say, and I believe this myself, people have the right and the duty to hold us accountable for decisions that send young men and women in harm's way. I think my colleague and I should be subjected to all the criticism that they have to offer. But I would also ask the war protestors to be intellectually honest and look at some of the facts. Because if you are just against war, maybe we should ask you this question: Have there been any wars that have benefited you? Did the Revolutionary War benefit you? Did the Civil War benefit you? Did World War II benefit you? Surely, in every case the soldiers and the political leaders, generally speaking, did not want war; and yet there were wars, terrible, horrible wars, and sometimes the benefits of those wars outweighed the tragedies. We are free today. We do not have to worry about an Adolf Hitler. We are an independent country today because our forefathers fought Great Britain.

Things like that are often the result of human conflict; yet the war protesters would rather say, well, we are just against this because we are going to kill innocent people. America is not the folks who are using humans as shields; it is Saddam Hussein who is moving people into weapons areas and targeted areas. So I think we have done almost everything we can through the U.N. I hope the U.N. will get on board. I hope Saddam Hussein will say, okay, guys, I give up. I hope that there is not a war, as I know the President and all the soldiers hope there is not a war; but there does come a time when you have to move forward.

If the gentleman would like to speak, I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me. I was listening to the gentleman's remarks from my office and decided to come down precisely to ask to join him for just a few minutes because I very much agreed with what he was saying.

I heard the gentleman speaking first on the President's economic plan to help create jobs in the United States. Eighty percent or more of the jobs in the United States are created by small business. And in my district, when I started to talk about the President's plan, what impressed me was the amount of small businessmen who spoke to me and told me that that provision in the President's plan to triple the amount that a small business can deduct from its taxes to make equipment purchases, in other words to expand the small business, is something

that will immediately not only inure to the benefit of those small businesses but will produce growth in those small businesses, will produce new small businesses and, thus, will produce jobs in this country.

The President's plan is multifaceted. It will create jobs in many ways. And I think it is incumbent upon us in this Congress to have a vigorous debate but to act quickly and pass that plan.

Of course, as the gentleman was saying with regard to the reality of the tyrant in Baghdad, I think the President just a few days ago, when he spoke here before us, made a very convincing case when he reminded the American people and the world that that tyrant in Baghdad has used in the past weapons of mass destruction. He not only possesses weapons of mass destruction, in the case of chemical weapons, biological weapons, but he has used those weapons against people within his own country.

Mr. KINGSTON. In fact, if the gentleman will yield, he used it on the Kurds and caused 2 million to be refugees into Turkey and Syria and other neighboring countries. Two million refugees because he used chemical weapons.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. So he had obviously an obligation, after he lost the war in 1991, to rid himself of all weapons of mass destruction. He not only did not do so, but in 1998 he expelled the United Nations inspectors.

Now, the fact is that the international community then, despite the fact that it had imposed a requirement on the tyrant in Baghdad to get rid of weapons and to permit inspections of the process of getting rid of those weapons, despite the fact that he not only did not get rid of the weapons, he not only did not facilitate the process that he had to because of resolutions of the international community by way of the Security Council, he not only did not cooperate, but he expelled the inspectors.

The fact that the international community, at that time led by the United States, did nothing does not excuse the inaction. The fact is that there is a President now who does not want to see and who certainly wants to do everything in his power to prevent what has occurred repeatedly in the past decade.

In 1993, there was a terrorist attack in New York that could have been much worse. It was a direct act of urban terrorism, which happened to be at the same site of the attack that killed 3,000 people on September 11, 2001. But the attack occurred already in early 1993, another attack, and then multiple other attacks occurred afterwards in that decade. And the reality of the matter is, as we said before, the tyrant in Baghdad has used weapons of mass destruction against people within Iraq, and he has not only not gotten rid of the weapons as required by international resolutions, but even now, fac-

ing the leadership of George W. Bush and facing a new initiative by the United Nations Security Council, he still, as the President reminded us a few days ago here, has not provided any evidence whatsoever of the destruction of his weapons of mass destruction.

In addition to that, he is close, as we have seen from declassified documents from British intelligence, close to acquiring a much more dreadful and dangerous weapon of mass destruction: a nuclear weapon. So, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, said recently when he testified before the committee that I am honored to be a member of, the Committee on Rules, and somebody said, well, where is the smoking gun? The gentleman from Illinois said, I think what we have an obligation to do is to do everything possible to avoid a smoking city.

How will the American people and history judge us if, knowing as we do that that tyrant in Baghdad has weapons of mass destruction, and knowing as we do that he has the relations that he has with other international terrorists, we simply acquiesce in doing nothing because, for example, some of our allies wish to do nothing? No, we have a responsibility. We have a responsibility to avoid a smoking city.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I think he has put it well. If we can go back to the pre 9-11 USA, there were tremors. As the gentleman said, in 1993, the bombing of the World Trade Center, embassy bombings two times in Africa, the *USS Cole* in Yemen. There were not just terrorist attacks but terrorist activities, and we had an opportunity to monitor it closer, but that did not happen. As is always the case when we look back, we see these red flags. And a lot of people have said, well, should we have done something? Well, now we have red flags all over the globe, and the President is doing something. Yet those same people who wanted a special independent commission to look into 9-11, now they are saying you are a warmonger because you want to do a preemptive strike.

□ 2100

You cannot have it both ways. This action against Saddam Hussein enables your family and my family to go to Main Street, to Wal-Mart on Saturday afternoon and the workplace 5 days a week and not worry, and that is what we have the right to do as Americans.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. We have an obligation. I agree with the gentleman. I think the primary obligation of government is to protect the people. The reason people came together and formed government in the first place was to protect themselves from common enemies of the community. And so I think the President has not only made a case, a very impressive case, he did so here and he

has done so repeatedly, but I happen to thank God repeatedly, and obviously the American people, for having elected a leader like the American people elected in November of 2000, a leader of the United States of America and of the Free World who, despite all the pressures, despite all the difficulties, he is doing everything imaginable, everything possible to comply with the first obligation of government, which is to protect the people.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely. Yet at the same time, a man of great sincerity and religious conviction who has said repeatedly he does not want war and does not take any of these decisions lightly. This is all done void of politics, void of reelection, void of election, void of polls. This President does these things for the right reason.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman. The gentleman is from Florida. The gentleman has been a leader in so many different issues and an active member of the Committee on Rules and someone who has certainly been very active on the question of American relations with Cuba. I do not want to touch base on Cuba, but I know that your brother talked to the President about it this weekend, and I thought the President, as usual, approached the whole question not with politics, but with conviction.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia bringing that subject up because while we are on the subject of terrorist states, it is important to remind our colleagues and the American people that there is one such terrorist state 90 miles from the shores of the United States, a terrorist state that harbors multiple terrorist organizations from throughout the world.

In this hemisphere we are facing extraordinary tragedies on a daily basis, especially in the wonderful country of Colombia whose people elected a president just months ago, and they have come together and they are fighting heroically against terrorism. Yet those terrorist groups that are attacking on a daily basis the people in Colombia receive not only orientation but guidance and, in effect, are in all sorts of dealings with the tyrant in Havana.

The reality of the matter is that the tyrant in Havana harbors terrorists not only from Colombia, from throughout the Western Hemisphere, from Spain, the Basque ETA terrorists, they have a base in Cuba. Just recently terrorists from the IRA Irish organization based in Cuba were arrested in Colombia for providing training to the Colombian FARC terrorists in urban warfare. We have seen recently a dreadful, horrible increase in the urban bloodshed, in the urban terrorism, in the bloodshed caused by the urban terrorism. Terrorists have trained those Colombian terrorists, terrorists based in Cuba. There

is this entire network that finds harbor, of terrorism, international terrorism, that finds safe harbor in Cuba. And that is a reality.

I was very pleased with the President's answer, because some people get confused when we deal with, for example, the trade ban on Communist Cuba and we say, we insist on three steps be taken in Cuba before there is a normalization of relations with the United States: Legalization of all political parties, labor unions, the press; liberation of all political prisoners; and the scheduling of free and fair elections with international supervision. When those steps happen, there will be normalization, and until those steps happen, there will not be.

President Bush is very clear and from the very beginning has made it very clear that he will not, and he has said so, he will veto any attempts if he has to to normalize relations until and unless those steps are taken, because the Cuban people, like the rest of the world, deserve freedom as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Right now we have some limited trade. We can trade with them, but it has to be on a cash basis.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. He has got to pay.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is for food and for medicine?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Yes.

Mr. KINGSTON. But there is a pressure to put tourism dollars in it. We have kind of drawn the line, this Congress has.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. What the dictatorship in Cuba most wants is the American tourist dollar, because the American tourist dollar, which would be billions even in the first year, would provide the repressive machinery obviously with a boost like it has not had in decades.

And the apartheid system that exists there where, for example, those tourist centers and the hospitals and the wonderful health centers, they are for people with foreign currency, with dollars, tourists, and of course the hierarchy of the dictatorship. The Cuban people have no access to those things.

But to maintain that system, obviously the dictatorship seeks the infusion of hard currency. The way in which the dictatorship could have the largest infusion of hard currency would be with the American tourist dollar.

What we are saying is, and President Bush agrees, liberate the political prisoners, legalize political parties, labor unions, the press, and schedule free elections, and then there will be normalization. Then you can have your tourist dollars. Not before. Not when the tourist dollars will inure to the benefit of the repressive machinery.

The President, and he was very clear again at the retreat in West Virginia this weekend, he made it clear that, number one, the policy is clearly rooted in a purpose, to contribute to a democratic transition from a terrorist regime 90 miles away. And also some

people and the President was very explicit on this, some people say, well, we have trade with China, why not with Cuba? The President was not only explicit, but went at length in explaining the differences.

There has been a capitalist resurgence in China with an entrepreneurial class and many differences and some decentralization of power, many differences from the Cuban situation. So even though I happen to have been and continue to be an opponent of business as usual with Communist China, I agree with the President that there are substantial differences. I think it was very appropriate for the President to have brought out and demonstrated once again his clarity, not only of vision but his grasp of the details with regard to important policy matters.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I may, I know the gentleman from Georgia has been one of the most interested Members of this House with regard to the need and the appropriateness to recognize the great accomplishments of the Hispanic community in the United States. I not only commend you for that, but thank you for your solidarity and always your sensitivity and your compassion to the Hispanics in this country and to Hispanic issues.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the great parts of my childhood growing up in Athens, Georgia, it was not so great for them particularly at the time was when so many Cubans fled Castro and Athens, Georgia, was one of the towns that they arrived in. I was raised with Maria Saladríguez and Rosa Chavez and all kinds of kids that came in the 10th grade and assimilated fairly quickly. But it was interesting, as we went to their house, they were still speaking Spanish; and their parents, who often had been physicians and professional businesspeople in Cuba, in Havana, were now reduced to working in laundromats and doing manual labor in America.

I actually sold my house to a guy named Roberto Casillo in Savannah, Georgia, and his family was among that crowd. His dad had been a doctor over there and it did not transfer. But all three of his sons became physicians. They are all practicing in Georgia.

What I have appreciated about the people who had to leave Cuba, who love Cuba to this day but cannot stand Castro, love America even more and have embraced America with this big bear hug and taken on all rights and privileges that, wait a minute, this is the land of the free, the land of opportunity.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. How are we going to feel about a nation, about a country that, for example, in my case when I also was a refugee child like those friends that you talked about that you grew up with, and I had to leave with my family as a refugee when I was 4 years old and arrived in this country. How are we to feel about a nation that not only permits us to go to schools in freedom

and to worship in the churches of our choice and to associate with whomever we wish to associate in freedom, but that has, through the ultimate generosity of spirit of the American people, permitted a refugee child who arrived at age 4 to be elected to the Congress of the United States and along with our other colleagues participate in the process of making laws for the American people? Only a country of ultimate spiritual greatness and generosity permits something like that.

And so that is something that not only we recognize as people who have come, in my case I know there are other Members of this House who also immigrated to this great land, not only do we recognize it, but we are reminded of it each and every day, the compassion of the American people, the greatness of the American people, the generosity of spirit of the American people has no parallel in the world.

That is why it hurts us so deeply when we see in other places of the world, now, for example, when the President is trying to lead an international coalition to disarm a tyrant who has weapons of mass destruction and is threatening the world, when we see allies, in some cases allies who had American GIs go and liberate them twice; and it takes going to the cemeteries in France and in Belgium and throughout Europe to see the heroism and the greatness of the American people, that twice in the 20th century liberated Europe, to see allies putting up now the roadblocks and the difficulties in the path of a President who wants to rid those allies' peoples, of the threat of weapons of mass destruction from a tyrant in Baghdad. It hurts.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman, you do not really talk about your story so much, but I think it is important. A friend of mine back in Savannah named Herman Cranman wrote a book called "A Measure of Life." In it, he talks about his World War II POW experience. He said he went into World War II as really a naive, young, idealistic kid and grew, of course, during the experience to see otherwise, but never lost his idealism.

But when he was captured, he said something very profound. He said as a born American living with freedom, freedom to me was like the water coming out of the tap in my kitchen. I didn't think anything of it until I turned on the tap and it wasn't there. When he was in a German POW camp, he found out what freedom was. What I have seen in you and in your brother and in Ileana Ros-Lehtinen is that you appreciate freedom every day, which we native-born Americans do not quite have the full view of so often. Yet I think in many cases people do realize it.

But here is what I want to know. Tell me about coming over here at 4. What were your parents doing in Cuba? How did you get out? Because I think people would be interested in that.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. It is obviously an interesting

story. It obviously is personal, and I think at some point it might be appropriate to talk about it, but I do not think necessarily it is the time to do so now.

Suffice it to say that those examples that you talked about, the people whom you met and my family and all who come from this particular vantage point of a country that was lost to a totalitarian tyranny and had the opportunity to come here and live day in and day out, the miracle of freedom, it is true what you have said that we not only do not take it for granted, but that there is not one day that we are not cognizant of the miracle of freedom.

With your indulgence, I would like to point out a story about a young, still a young man who is also Hispanic. He did not come from Cuba. He came from Honduras.

Mr. KINGSTON. But he is still an immigrant and came over here.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. That is correct. He came when he was 17 years old. Like so many of us, obviously the dream of his family, and his dream as well, was to be able to live in this marvelous country of freedom and to have a chance to work hard, to have a chance to work hard and live a dignified life that he, his family and all Americans could be proud of.

□ 2115

And this young man came over at age 17, did not speak English, got to work immediately, though, worked so hard, was such a good student that he was able to go to Columbia University, obviously on a scholarship. His parents did not have the money to send him. He worked so hard in Columbia. He got extraordinarily good grades. He got a scholarship to go to Harvard Law School and there not only did he do well, he became editor of the law review. I am a lawyer. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is a lawyer too, is he not?

Mr. KINGSTON. No, I am not. But I do know that he was magna cum laude in Harvard and in Columbia.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. The gentleman knows what it means to be law review editor.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. The law review editor, only the most superb legal minds in law school are able to become, in effect, the leaders at the law review, the editor of the law review. And this young man who did not speak English at 17, by the time he was in law school was editor of the law review.

Anyway, he graduated from law school, was such a talented jurist that he was able to become a law clerk for a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. And later he became an associate solicitor general, representing the Government of the United States before the Supreme Court of the United States, arguing cases. Obviously only very important

cases get heard by the Supreme Court, and obviously only someone of extraordinary talent and ability can argue on behalf of the Government of the United States as an associate solicitor general before the Supreme Court. Fifteen cases he argued before the Supreme Court.

He is an extraordinary symbol of success of what is referred to as the American dream. But I know it must seem hard to believe, but the Democrats have now said that they are going to stop in the Senate President Bush's nomination of this jurist, of this extraordinary young man, President Bush's nomination of this man to be in the second most important court, a member of the second most important court in the United States, the court of appeals here in the District of Columbia. His name is Miguel Estrada, and now the Democrats are saying that because he is not a leftist, because he does not have a record of leftist, extremist, so-called accomplishments, whatever they are supposed to be, that the Senate is not going to confirm him.

In the long history of the Republic, in that second most important court in the United States, the District of Columbia's Federal Court of Appeals, there has never been a Hispanic nominated by a President of the United States just like there has never been a Hispanic nominated by a President of the United States to the most important court, to the Supreme Court of the land. This man with the extraordinary record that he has where even the American Bar Association, which cannot be called a conservative organization under any measuring ability, the American Bar Association says that Miguel Estrada is very, very competent, that he is superbly qualified.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I just want to underscore that as I understand it, Mr. Estrada has argued 15 cases before the Supreme Court all before the age of 40. One of them was pro bono for a death row inmate. He received unanimous "well qualified" ratings from the American Bar Association. That is their highest rating. He has worked in the Justice Department both under Democrat and Republican administrations and has demonstrated a commitment to uphold the integrity of the law and dedication to public service.

Estrada has received an outstanding rating in every performance category in his years in service in the solicitor general's office. And Clinton's solicitor general called him "an extraordinary legal talent" and genuinely compassionate. What is scary, if we compare his qualifications, because the gentleman from Florida has mentioned that they never had a Hispanic on that court, it is really to me after all we have been talking about freedom in America that we have to bring in this question of race, but it does seem there are those in the Senate against Mr. Estrada that may be aware of that. Maybe it is as simple as they do not

want the Republicans to nominate somebody who is Hispanic. They want to have the lock on it. Maybe that is the idea; I do not know.

But I do know this, that if we compare Miguel Estrada's qualification with Merrick Garland, Garland was 41 when he was nominated, 44 and 41. They both were Phi Beta Kappa. They both graduated magna cum laude from Harvard. They both did the Harvard Law Review as editor. They both have served as law clerks for the U.S. Court of Appeals Second Circuit. They were both law clerks for the U.S. Supreme Court. They have both done 7 years private practice. Mr. Estrada was 2 years with the Assistant U.S. Attorney; Mr. Garland, 3 years. They were both with the U.S. Justice Department, in Estrada's case, 1992 to 1997; in Garland's case, 1993 to 1997. They both had bipartisan support. Garland, 100 days before the Senate approved his nomination. Estrada, 631. The only difference in this category is race, 631 days compared to 100 days.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. One of the ways in which the Democrats are objecting to Miguel Estrada's nomination, they are saying we want to see the internal memoranda that Mr. Estrada wrote when he was an assistant solicitor general. We want to see the internal memoranda because, number one, we want to see all the internal writings and, number two, we do not like Mr. Estrada because he is not a judge already. Those are the two main arguments that are being used against Mr. Estrada by the Democrats.

Let us analyze those two roadblocks that are being put down by the Democrats to try to stop Miguel Estrada's confirmation. There have been 67 cases approved by the Senate of nominees to the United States Courts of Appeals who previously worked at the Department of Justice. In none of the 67 cases have the internal memoranda of those judges, when they worked for the Department of Justice like Mr. Estrada, who was an assistant solicitor general, in none of the 67 cases have the internal memoranda been made public. But in the case of Miguel Estrada, he is the only one that the Democrats are saying we want to see the internal memoranda.

I am the first one to say that Miguel Estrada deserves to be a judge of the appellate court not because he is Hispanic but rather I am also the first one to say that he deserves to be a judge and he deserves not to be stopped because he is a Hispanic. And we see that in 67 other cases they have not made public the internal memoranda and that has not stopped the nomination, but in the case of Miguel Estrada that is an impediment. And another thing. The thing about he is not a judge now. Precisely. There has not been one Hispanic named before President Bush named Miguel Estrada to the appellate court of the District of Columbia in the history of the Republic. How do you expect Hispanics to come before the Senate already having been judges if this

is the first nomination of a judge by a President of the United States who is Hispanic to the second most important court? A glaring problem is the lack of Hispanic judges until now. President Bush is trying to remedy that; and the Democrats are placing roadblocks, because he is Hispanic, in the path of a decent and honorable man with a superb record.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, this obviously never was a problem until a Hispanic came before the Democratic Senators. The reason I say that is five of the eight judges serving in the D.C. Circuit had no prior judicial experience. That includes two of President Clinton's nominees, Mr. Garland, whom we talked about earlier whose justice record was quite similar to Mr. Estrada's, and David Tatel. It also includes Judge Harry Edwards, who was appointed by President Carter in 1980, and Edwards was younger than Estrada. Five out of eight of them did not have to have judicial experience, but suddenly a Hispanic comes along and this is a big issue. Another thing that is interesting is that on the Supreme Court now, two of the judges, Byron White, nominated by President Kennedy, and William Rehnquist, the current Chief Justice, had no prior judicial experience when appointed to the Supreme Court, but now it is a different program, a different standard.

The other thing that is interesting is that the Democrats who are trying to torpedo Mr. Estrada also will claim he does not have Hispanic support, which I would say, number one, this is not a poll, this is not a popularity contest; but, number two, he actually has the endorsement of the League of the United Latin American Citizens, which is the country's oldest Hispanic civil rights organization; the Hispanic National Bar Association; the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; the Hispanic Business Roundtable; the Latino Coalition; and many other Latino groups. They are all supporting him, and yet that does not count, I guess.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Exactly. Actually, I would agree with the gentleman that once one analyzes, if one has a chance to go through the road blocks and analyze them, one realizes that they are farcical. But it is really sad here because we are dealing with a life of a human being. We are not dealing with a farce. We are dealing with the life of a real human being who came to this country at age 17 to work very hard, and he has worked very hard and he makes all Americans proud. And if I may, I think it is relevant to point out, by the way, when Mr. Estrada was Solicitor General, most of the years that he was Solicitor General was under a Democratic administration, the administration of President Clinton; and let us hear what Mr. Clinton's Solicitor General has to say about Mr. Estrada. This is Seth Waxman, the former Solicitor General under President Clinton: "During the time that Mr. Estrada and I worked to-

gether, he was a model of professionalism and competence. I greatly enjoyed working with Miguel, profited from our interactions, and was genuinely sorry when he decided to leave the office in favor of private practice. I have great respect both for Mr. Estrada's intellect and for his integrity. In no way did I ever discern that the recommendations Mr. Estrada made or the views he propounded were colored in any way by his personal views or indeed that they reflected anything other than the long-term interests of the United States." That is Clinton's Solicitor General.

If I may read the comments of Ronald Klain, the former counselor to Vice President Gore: "Miguel Estrada is a person of outstanding character, tremendous intellect, and with a deep commitment to the faithful application of precedent. Miguel will rule as a judge justly toward all, without showing favor to any group or individual. The challenges he has overcome in his life have made him genuinely compassionate, genuinely concerned for others, and genuinely divided to helping those in need."

□ 2130

My dear friend, the Democrats have chosen the wrong case upon which to make a stand in opposition. They chose the wrong case when they placed roadblocks before a young man who arrived at 17 from Honduras and got here to work hard and has worked hard and made all Americans proud. They have chosen the wrong case when they oppose an immigrant, a Hispanic immigrant, who arrived here and who has made his family and all Hispanics proud. They have chosen the wrong case.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wonder, because we talked about immigrant patriotism before, maybe their problem, after all, is not that he is Hispanic. Maybe their problem is the fact that he is an immigrant and therefore more pro-American than the average person, and they cannot stand the fact of a patriotic, God-fearing family and country-first American sitting on the judicial bench, which, in my opinion, we need a heck of a lot more of.

I never met Mr. Estrada, but that is what he sounds like. If he is anything like the Diaz-Balart brothers, I know he is.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I share another thing with the gentleman, and I have not met him either. What has incensed me and what has bothered me to the core is that people on the other side of the aisle are accusing him of not being Hispanic enough. When I heard those accusations and I read his biography, because when I started hearing the accusations I started studying the biography and the work of the life of this immigrant, Miguel Estrada, it has bothered me to the core that they would have chosen to make a political case out of a man who arrived here as

a very young man and has done nothing more but in an honest and day-in-and-day-out intense manner worked hard to honor his family and his country. It is extremely bothersome.

I think the American people who have had the opportunity to hear us tonight, I am sure, must be bothered as well. What I would urge is that since in these upcoming hours the other body is going to have that decision to make, I would urge that they not make the serious mistake, because of petty politics, to stop, in effect, the career of a brilliant young man who has done nothing but work hard to honor his family, to honor all Hispanics, to honor all immigrants, and, yes, to honor the United States of America.

I thank the gentleman very much for the opportunity to have been able to join him.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I have to ask the gentleman, since he kind of dodged my early solicitation for personal biographical information, how old was he when he was first elected to Congress?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I was confused, because the gentleman said I dodged his question when he asked about my personal background. By the way, I am very proud of my family's background. In no way did I want to seem when I did not want to get into the family background today that I am not proud of it. I am, as I am proud of all Cuban Americans and all Hispanics and all immigrants in this country and all Americans. But I did not want to get into that, because I wanted to focus tonight on Miguel Estrada.

Mr. KINGSTON. The reason why I asked, when the gentleman and I came to Congress we were both a little bit younger. But the reality is here is a guy 41 years old. He is a star, a rising star. Maybe the Democrats think that they can put a notch on their holster if they shoot this guy down and stop him in his tracks.

I hope they do not. I hope he continues to rise, not because he is young, not because he is a Hispanic, not because he is an immigrant, but because he is pro-American and he wants to do what is right, and that is what we need on our judicial benches all over America.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I agree with the gentleman and commend him on his hard work on so many issues, day in and day out. The gentleman from Georgia is an honor to this Congress, his district and constituents, and to all of the American people.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman, and thank him for everything he does.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina). The Chair will remind all Members that it is not

in order to urge the Senate to take a particular action with regard to a presidential nomination, and avoid criticisms of that body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for February 5 on account of attending to district business.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANKS of Arizona) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, February 12.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, February 12.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEAUPREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOEHNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TERRY, for 5 minutes, February 12.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, February 12.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 12, 2003, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

568. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of Title 31, Section 1341(a)(1)(A), by the Department of the Navy, case number 99-09B; to the Committee on Appropriations.

569. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a re-

port on cervical cancer screening; to the Committee on Armed Services.

570. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Retention of Records Relevant to Audits and Reviews [Release Nos. 33-8180; 34-47241; IC-25911; FR-66; File No. S7-46-02] (RIN: 3235-A174) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

571. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Insider Trades During Pension Fund Blackout Periods [Release No. 34-47225; IC-25909; File No. S7-44-02] (RIN: 3235-A171) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

572. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priority — Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

573. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priority — Rehabilitation Training: Rehabilitation Long-Term Training Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

574. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Alternative Fuel Vehicles reports for FY 1999-2001, pursuant to Public Law 105-388 section 310 112 stat. 3481; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

575. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Policies and Rules for the Direct Broadcast Satellite Service [IB Docket No. 98-21] received January 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

576. A letter from the Chair, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, pursuant to Public Law 104-191, section 263 (110 Stat. 2033); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

577. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 02-03 which informs of an intent to sign Amendment Number Three to the Cooperative Ballistic Missile Defense Research Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and Japan, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

578. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 01-03 which informs of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and Singapore for Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation Projects, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

579. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the fiftieth report on the extent and disposition of United States contributions to international organizations for fiscal year 2001, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 262a; to the Committee on International Relations.

580. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting text of agreements in which the American Institute in Taiwan is a party between January 1 and December 31, 2001, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

581. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification for the government of Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

582. A letter from the President and CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting a report on steps the Corporation has taken over the past year to expand its activities in sub-Saharan Africa, including the invigoration of the Corporation's Africa Investment Council, pursuant to (114 Stat. 270); to the Committee on International Relations.

583. A letter from the Special Assistant to the President and Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the White House personnel report for the fiscal year 2002, pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 113; to the Committee on Government Reform.

584. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-627, "Local, Small and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Program Temporary Amendment Act of 2003" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

585. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-626, "Prevention of Premature Release of Mentally Incompetent Defendants Temporary Amendment Act of 2003" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

586. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-625, "Rehabilitation Services Program Establishment Temporary Act of 2003" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

587. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-624, "Bowling Alley and Billiard Parlor Temporary Act of 2003" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

588. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-623, "Tax Increment Financing Reauthorization Temporary Act of 2003" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

589. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-622, "Criminal Code and Miscellaneous Technical Amendments Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

590. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-621, "Removal from the Permanent System of Highways, a Portion of 22nd Street, S.E., and the Dedication of Land for Street Purposes (S.O. 00-89) Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

591. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-620, "Council Review of the Exclusive Right Agreement for the Redevelopment of the Existing Convention Center Site Amendment Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

592. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-619, "District Anti-Deficiency Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

593. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-618, "Energy and Operational Efficiency Performance-Based Contracting Amendment Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

594. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-617, "Mental Health Civil Commitment Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

595. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-616, "Tax Clarity and Recorder of Deeds Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

596. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-615, "Procurement Practices Vendor Payment Authorization Amendment Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

597. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-614, "Urban Forest Preservation Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

598. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-613, "Electronic Recording Procedures Act of 2002" received February 10, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

599. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

600. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

601. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

602. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

603. A letter from the Deputy White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

604. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2002 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

605. A letter from the Acting Director of Human Resources Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

606. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

607. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

608. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's FY 2002 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability; to the Committee on Government Reform.

609. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

610. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

611. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

612. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002, through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

613. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Circular 2001-11; Introduction — received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

614. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting the Office's Audit Report Register for the period ending September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

615. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

616. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Fiscal Year 2002 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

617. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation or Non Designation of Critical Habitat for 95 Plant Species From the Islands of Kauai and Niihau, Hawaii, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

618. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Fishery Management Plan for the Shrimp Fishery off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 5 [Docket No. 020816198-2315-02; I.D. 071202A] (RIN: 0648-AP41) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

619. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission On Civil Rights, transmitting the list of state advisory committees recently rechartered by the Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

620. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Picture Identification Requirements [Docket No. FAA-2002-11666; Amendment No. 61-107] (RIN: 2120-AH76) received January 17, 2003,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

621. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Aging Airplane Safety [Docket No. FAA-1999-5401; Amdt. Nos. 119-6, 121-284, 129-34, 135-81, and 183-11] (RIN: 2120-AE42) received January 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

622. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Noise Certification Standards for Subsonic Jet Airplanes and Subsonic Transport Category Large Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2000-7587 Amdt No. 21-81, 36-24 & 91-275] (RIN: 2120-AH03) received January 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

623. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspeed Indicating System Requirements for Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2001-9636; Amendment No. 25-109] (RIN: 2120-AH26) received January 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

624. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No. 29334; Amendment No. 71-34] received January 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

625. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Robinson R-22/R-44 Special Training and Experience Requirements [Docket No. FAA-2002-13744; SFAR No. 73-1] (RIN: 2120-AH94) received January 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

626. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service Difficulty Reports [Docket No. FAA-2000-7952] (RIN: 2120-AH91) received January 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

627. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an Agreement between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Norway on Social Security, with a related administrative agreement, both signed at Oslo on November 30, 2001, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1); (H. Doc. No. 108—38); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

628. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination and recognition of gain or loss (Rev. Rul. 2003-7) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

629. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2003-16) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

630. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Certain Cost Sharing Payments (Rev. Rul. 2003-15) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

631. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule — Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2003-20) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

632. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Nonaccrual Experience Method of Accounting [Notice 2003-12] received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

633. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Certain cost sharing payments (Rev. Rul. 2003-14) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

634. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disclosure of Returns and Return Information by Other Agencies [TD 9036] (RIN: 1545-AY77) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous (Rev. Proc. 2003-1) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

636. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Notice 2003-8] received January 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

637. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Constructive Sales Treatment for Appreciated Financial Positions (Rev. Rul. 2003-1) received January 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

638. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2003-15) received January 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

639. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Private Foundation Transfers of Assets (Rev. Rul. 2003-13, 2003-4 I.R.B.) received January 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

640. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2003-7) received January 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

641. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Last-in, First-out Inventories (Rev. Rul. 2003-9) received January 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

642. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rules and Regulations (Rev. Proc. 2003-14) received January 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

643. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department of State's intent to initiate the FY 2003 International Military Education and Training program for Algeria; jointly to the

Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

644. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a legislative proposal to establish the Millennium Challenge Account and the Millennium Challenge Corporation; (H. Doc. No. 108—37); jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Resources, and Government Reform and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 395. A bill to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to collect fees for the implementation and enforcement of a "do-not-call" registry, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. EMANUEL):

H.R. 657. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to augment the emergency authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 658. A bill to provide for the protection of investors, increase confidence in the capital markets system, and fully implement the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 by streamlining the hiring process for certain employment positions in the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 659. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act regarding the requirements for mortgage insurance under such Act for hospitals; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FLETCHER (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HART, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina,

Mr. KELLER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. NORTUP, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 660. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit financial institutions to determine their interest expense deduction without regard to tax-exempt bonds issued to provide certain small loans for health care or educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKELTON:

H.R. 662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve tax equity for military personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BURR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GORDON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JOHN, and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 663. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the improvement of patient safety and to reduce the incidence of events that adversely affect patient safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 664. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II and surviving spouses of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 665. A bill to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income of individual taxpayers discharges of indebtedness attributable to certain forgiven residential mortgage obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 667. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an inflation adjustment of the dollar limitation on the exclusion of gain on the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 668. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow credits against income tax for an owner of a radio broadcasting station which donates the license and other assets of such station to a nonprofit corporation for purposes of supporting nonprofit fine arts and performing arts organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 669. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale or rental of adult video games to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 670. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide for identification, mitigation, and purchase of properties insured under the national flood insurance program that suffer repetitive losses; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 671. A bill to reauthorize and revise the Renewable Energy Production Incentive program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 672. A bill to rename the Guam South Elementary/Middle School of the Department of Defense Domestic Dependents Elementary and Secondary Schools System in honor of Navy Commander William "Willie" McCool, who was the pilot of the Space Shuttle Columbia when it was tragically lost on February 1, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 673. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act regarding the conformity of transportation projects to implementation plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 674. A bill to authorize the President to present a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the Choctaw Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 675. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the cap on Medicaid payments for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa and to adjust the Medicaid statutory matching rate for those territories; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 676. A bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance coverage for all United States residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce,

and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Resources, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ISSA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CASE, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALVARADO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama:

H.R. 678. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to provide for comprehensive community and economic development in the distressed Southern Black Belt and Mississippi Delta region while leveraging existing efforts, entities, and resources; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 679. A bill to prohibit certain late term abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 680. A bill to provide tax relief and assistance for the families of the heroes of the Space Shuttle Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 681. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit an authorized committee of a winning candidate for election for Federal office which received a personal loan from the candidate from making any repayment on the loan after the date on which the candidate begins serving in such office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Ms. HART, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 682. A bill to amend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 to provide for additional weeks of benefits to exhaustees; to modify the AIUR trigger used in determining eligibility for second-tier benefits; and to provide for an extension of the temporary extended unemployment program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the special allowance for depreciation for certain property acquired after September 10, 2001, from 30 percent to 100 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 684. A bill to provide scholarships for District of Columbia elementary and secondary students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FARR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACA, Mr. STARK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 685. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to repeal the provisions prohibiting persons convicted of drug offenses from receiving student financial assistance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the scheduled increases in eligibility for individual retirement plans and to eliminate the marriage penalty in determining such eligibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 687. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from accepting a form of identification issued by a foreign government, except for a passport that is accepted for such a purpose on the date of enactment of this Act; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself and Mr. OTTER):

H.R. 688. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study of the effectiveness of silver-based biocides as an alternative treatment to preserve wood; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 689. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow residents of States with no income tax a deduction for State and local sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 690. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicaid Program of organ transplant procedures as an emergency medical procedure for certain alien children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow corporations to claim a charitable deduction for the donation of services related to contributions of computer technology or equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 692. A bill to provide for racial equity and fair treatment under the program of

block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HAYES, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MICA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain death gratuity payments to members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an interest-free source of capital to cover the costs of installing residential solar energy equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINNIS (for himself, Mr. TANCREDI, and Mr. BEAUPREZ):

H.R. 695. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make a grant to support research to develop enhanced methods for the long-term control and suppression of the invasive plant species tamarisk in the Colorado River watershed in western Colorado and eastern Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H.R. 696. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to restrict the disqualification of students for drug offenses to those students who committed offenses while receiving student financial aid; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate a high priority corridor in California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 698. A bill to provide for and approve settlement of certain land claims of the Wyandotte Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT:

H.R. 699. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a comprehensive study of the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer, located in Idaho and Washington; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 700. A bill to amend the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure to require written opinions in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 701. A bill to restore to the original owners certain lands that the Federal Government took for military purposes in 1940; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 702. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to increase the Federal share

for certain safety and other projects on energy impacted highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 703. A bill to provide for the use of COPS funds for State and local intelligence officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 704. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a joint special resources study to evaluate the suitability and feasibility of establishing the area known as the Rim of the Valley Corridor as a unit of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHROCK:

H.R. 705. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain table tennis tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 706. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to promote secure and healthy families under the temporary assistance to needy families program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H.R. 707. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit direct payment under the Medicare Program for clinical social worker services provided to residents of skilled nursing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 708. A bill to require the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in Mendocino National Forest, California, to provide for the use of the proceeds from such conveyance for National Forest purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NORWOOD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. FROST, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HALL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 709. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require Department of Veterans Affairs pharmacies to dispense medications to veterans for prescriptions written by private practitioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to human rights in Central Asia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the establishment of a National Inventors' Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. PELOSI, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 61. A resolution commending the people of Israel for conducting free and fair elections, reaffirming the friendship between the Governments and peoples of the United States and Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEMINT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PORTER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. HART):

H. Res. 62. A resolution recognizing the courage and sacrifice of those members of the United States Armed Forces who were held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam conflict and calling for a full accounting of the 1,902 members of the Armed Forces who remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONILLA:

H. Res. 63. A resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H. Res. 64. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 65. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the military service of Filipinos during World War II and their eligibility for benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. TURNER of Texas):

H. Res. 66. A resolution supporting responsible fatherhood and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 710. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Narusewicz of Erie, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 711. A bill for the relief of Johanna Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER:

H.R. 712. A bill for the relief of Richi James Lesley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. CAMP, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 5: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCINNIS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. MICA, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 12: Ms. WATSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 20: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. NEY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 21: Mr. TERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 23: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 33: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GILLMORE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FARR, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 44: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 49: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. LORRETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PAUL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. TERRY and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 57: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 73: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 105: Mr. OWENS and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 140: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 141: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 167: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 172: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 173: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SHIFF, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 192: Ms. DUNN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 203: Mr. HOUGHTON and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 218: Mr. GOODE, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 235: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 240: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 258: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 271: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 284: Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. OTTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SABO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 302: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 303: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. VITTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 324: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 336: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 339: Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 340: Ms. DUNN and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 342: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 373: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STARK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 378: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 383: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 395: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 396: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 401: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 412: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 431: Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 433: Mr. HERGER and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 434: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. VITTER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 436: Ms. NORTON and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 442: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 444: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 456: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 466: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 478: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 487: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 490: Mr. COOPER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 501: Mr. BERRY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 506: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 513: Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 522: Mr. BURR, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 528: Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 531: Mr. ROGERS of Washington, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 534: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. JOHN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 545: Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 581: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 584: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 589: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 594: Mr. WALSH, Mr. BACA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FLETCHER, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 613: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.J. Res. 3: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GREEN of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. JENKINS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. LINDER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.J. Res. 12: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BACA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. KIND, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.J. Res. 15: Mr. FLAKE.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. KLINE.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. BELL.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. HOFFFEL and Ms. LEE.

H. Con. Res. 19: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BACA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 22: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINDER, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. NEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. PLATTS.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. HYDE.

H. Res. 43: Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 49: Mr. BACA, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr.

LAHOOD, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HALL, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Res. 56: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr.

REYES, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SABO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CASE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FROST, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BECERRA.

H. Res. 58: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. KLECZKA.